

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

203452

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 760--81st Congress
Chapter 897--2d Session
H. R. 4800

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 760	1
Index and Summary of History on H. R. 4800	1

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 760

MINERALS; LANDS. Directs the Department of Agriculture to sell all mineral interests which have been reserved or acquired by it under FHA and preceding programs, except the submarginal land programs and the program for liquidation of the farm-labor camps. Provides that such sales shall be only to owners of the surface who apply for purchase. In areas where there is no active mineral development or leasing, such sales would be made for \$1.00. In other areas the sales would be for fair market value. Also directs the Secretary to authorize the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell mineral interests in conformity with this policy, and provides that if the mineral interests are not sold within seven years they shall be transferred to Interior Department.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 4800

May 20, 1949	H. R. 4800 was introduced by Rep. Granger and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as introduced.
June 14, 1949	House Committee reported H. R. 4800 with amendment. House Report 803. Print of the bill as reported.
June 17, 1949	S. 2104 was introduced by Senator Thomas and was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Print of the bill as introduced.
June 20, 1949	House debated and passed H. R. 4800 as reported.
June 21, 1949	Print of H. R. 4800 as referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
January 19, 1950	Hearings: Senate, H. R. 4800. Hearings not printed. Resume of hearings by N. A. Back.
March 8, 1950	Senate Committee reported H. R. 4800 with amendment. Senate Report 1327. Print of the bill as reported.
April 19, 1950	Senate discussed H. R. 4800 and passed over on objection.
June 8, 1950	Senate discussed and passed over.
August 8, 1950	Senate discussed and passed over.
August 9, 1950	Passed over in Senate on objection.
August 23, 1950	Senate debated and passed H. R. 4800 with an amendment. Senate conferees appointed.
August 24, 1950	House concurred in the Senate amendment.
September 6, 1950	Approved. Public Law 760.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4800

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 20, 1949

Mr. GRANGER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Sec-
4 retary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secre-
5 tary") is authorized and directed to sell, as hereinafter
6 provided, all mineral interests now owned by the United
7 States, which have been reserved or acquired by it under
8 any program heretofore administered by the Resettlement
9 Administration, or the Farm Security Administration, or now
10 administered by the Farmers Home Administration, except
11 the program administered pursuant to title III of the Bank-

1 head-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the program
2 for the liquidation of labor camps pursuant to Public Law
3 298, Eightieth Congress.

4 SEC. 2. Such mineral interests shall be sold only to pri-
5 vate persons who shall apply therefor and who at the time
6 of application are the owners of the surface of the land
7 covered by the application. Applicants shall establish their
8 title to the surface of the land covered by the application
9 to the satisfaction of the Secretary at their own expense.
10 Conveyances of mineral interests shall be by quitclaim deed
11 executed by the Secretary or his delegate.

12 SEC. 3. In areas where the Secretary determines there
13 is no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral
14 interests covered by a single application shall be sold for
15 a consideration of \$1. In other areas the mineral interests
16 shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined
17 by the Secretary after taking into consideration such
18 appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate. Area deter-
19 minations made by the Secretary pursuant to this section
20 may be revised from time to time and the consideration
21 to be obtained for the mineral interests in connection with
22 any particular tract of land shall be determined by the rule
23 applicable to the area in which the tract is located at the
24 time of the application therefor.

25 SEC. 4. The Secretary is directed to authorize the Fed-

1 eral Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell and convey the
2 mineral interests heretofore or hereafter acquired by it in
3 conformity with the policy expressed in this Act with
4 respect to the mineral interests described in section 1 hereof.

5 SEC. 5. All proceeds from sales made under this Act
6 of mineral interests described in section 1 hereof shall be
7 covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscel-
8 laneous receipts, except that the proceeds from sales of
9 mineral interests which were a part of or derived from the
10 assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with
11 State rural rehabilitation corporations shall be credited to
12 the appropriate corporation account.

13 SEC. 6. The Secretary may make such rules and regu-
14 lations and such delegations of authority as he may deem
15 necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

16 SEC. 7. No application for the purchase of mineral
17 interests under this Act shall be filed until ninety days after
18 this Act becomes effective.

19 SEC. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated to the
20 Secretary such sums as Congress may from time to time
21 determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
22 out the provisions of this Act.

A BILL

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRANGER

MAY 20, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

81st CONGRESS
1st Session

S. 2104

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 17 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced the following bill; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral
interests, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Sec-
4 retary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secre-
5 tary") is authorized and directed to sell, as hereinafter
6 provided, all mineral interests now owned by the United
7 States, which have been reserved or acquired by it under
8 any program heretofore administered by the Resettlement
9 Administration, or the Farm Security Administration, or
10 now administered by the Farmers Home Administration,
11 except the program administered pursuant to title III of

1 the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and
2 the program for the liquidation of labor camps pursuant to
3 Public Law 298, Eightieth Congress.

4 SEC. 2. Such mineral interests shall be sold only to
5 private persons who shall apply therefor and who at the time
6 of application are the owners of the surface of the land cov-
7 ered by the application. Applicants shall establish their
8 title to the surface of the land covered by the application
9 to the satisfaction of the Secretary at their own expense.
10 Conveyances of mineral interests shall be by quitclaim deed
11 executed by the Secretary or his delegate.

12 SEC. 3. In areas where the Secretary determines there
13 is no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral
14 interests covered by a single application shall be sold for
15 a consideration of \$1. In other areas the mineral interests
16 shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined
17 by the Secretary after taking into consideration such ap-
18 praisals as he deems necessary or appropriate. Area de-
19 terminations made by the Secretary pursuant to this section
20 may be revised from time to time and the consideration to
21 be obtained for the mineral interests in connection with any
22 particular tract of land shall be determined by the rule
23 applicable to the area in which the tract is located at the
24 time of the application therefor.

25 SEC. 4. The Secretary is directed to authorize the Fed-

1 eral Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell and convey the
2 mineral interests heretofore or hereafter acquired by it in
3 conformity with the policy expressed in this Act with respect
4 to the mineral interests described in section 1 hereof.

5 SEC. 5. All proceeds from sales made under this Act of
6 mineral interests described in section 1 hereof shall be cov-
7 ered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
8 receipts, except that the proceeds from sales of mineral
9 interests which were a part of or derived from the assets
10 transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with State
11 Rural Rehabilitation Corporations shall be credited to the
12 appropriate corporation account.

13 SEC. 6. The Secretary may make such rules and regula-
14 tions and such delegations of authority as he may deem
15 necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

16 SEC. 7. No application for the purchase of mineral
17 interests under this Act shall be filed until ninety days after
18 this Act becomes effective.

19 SEC. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated to the
20 Secretary such sums as Congress may from time to time
21 determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
22 out the provisions of this Act.

A BILL

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma

JUNE 17 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

dition to the compensation payable to the lessor under the terms of the lease, shall pay all irrigation charges properly assessed against such lands pursuant to the provisions of section 1 hereof, and which become payable during the term of the lease. All leases to which this subsection applies shall be duly recorded in the office of the county clerk of the county in which the leased lands are located, the cost thereof to be paid by the lessee. A copy of each lease shall also be filed by the lessee with the Coachella Valley County Water District, or such other irrigation or water district within which the leased lands may be located.

(d) Rent or other payment for the use of land leased under this section shall not be collected or paid more than 5 years in advance unless so provided in the lease.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to apply to leases for the exploitation of oil, gas, or other minerals, or to repeal or affect any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

Sec. 9. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell any restricted land of deceased allottees upon the application of the heirs or devisees owning a majority interest therein: *Provided*, That notice of the proposed sale and its terms shall be mailed to each of the heirs or devisees at his last known address and no valid objection is filed within 30 days from the date of mailing of such notice.

Sec. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 24, after the word "authorized" insert "and directed."

On page 3, line 3, after the word "reservations", strike out the balance of line 3, all of lines 4, 5, 6, and line 7 down to and including the word "purposes" and insert "All wells located on any of the lands included in the said water district shall, together with the well sites, become the property of the owners of the surrounding lands, but none of such wells shall be operated for irrigation purposes so long as the lands on which they are located remain a part of said water district."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 801 (D) OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 562) to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make some inquiry of some member of the committee. I notice this bill is a very deserving one. It is amazing that heretofore there could have been exported from the United States, as the committee report shows, any drug or device, no matter how dangerous, as long as it accords with the specification of the foreign purchaser, and if in the country to which the article is being exported there

was no law outlawing such dangerous, adulterated, or mislabeled product. Only a limited number of countries have effective pure food and drug laws.

This is a glaring example of what some people call "atheistic capitalism," shipping food and drugs abroad that are dangerous to the health of the people. Certainly it produces a very bad reaction against our own country when that happens.

The committee is to be congratulated. But I notice the committee made some amendments to the original bill. I am not going to object, but I am wondering if this bill passes, if it will enable any drug or medicine or anything that is harmful to human beings to be exported out of the United States, even if according to the law of the country to which it is being exported, it is not in violation of any law. I would like my friend to answer that inquiry.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The proposed amendments would make applicable to foods, drugs, and devices that are to be exported the same requirements that are applicable to such products in interstate commerce, unless such products comply with the foreign law or pharmacopoeia, different from our own law or the United States Pharmacopoeia.

The committee went into this bill very thoroughly. We do not want to put any unnecessary, burdensome restrictions upon exporters. We did not want to hamstring the export business, yet we wanted to give full protection to all purchasers of these products.

Of course, a large majority of the exporters are in favor of this bill because they are largely complying with the provisions of the Food and Drug Act. There were only a few who were chiseling. The bill is better, we think, as it is amended than when it was originally introduced. We do not require the American exporter to become familiar with all of the laws and regulations of every foreign country. As long as he meets the requirement for goods in interstate commerce in the United States, we are satisfied with that.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, despite the lack of law in any other country, if these exported goods do not conform with the requirements established by law in relation to interstate commerce in the United States they cannot be exported; is that correct?

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I desired to make certain comments. I was amazed when I read this committee report to learn that such conditions existed. The committee is to be highly congratulated. I wanted to be sure that in the opinion of the committee the problem confronting the committee was adequately met by the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Michigan is doing such an excellent

job answering questions that I wish to ask him one myself. If I understand this bill it means that Americans traveling abroad can be sure of the purity of products manufactured in the United States when they buy them abroad.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Which is not the case at the moment. If this bill passes, however, the only way that Americans traveling abroad could get an inferior or dangerous product of United States manufacture would be if it had been adulterated after it left the United States.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It will strengthen our good neighbor policy as well, will it not?

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It will not only be for the benefit of Americans abroad but it will have the same beneficial effect upon the national of other countries; and if there is any adulteration it will be only after the product has left this country.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. It will protect practically everyone. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that when an American travels abroad and goes into a drugstore to make a purchase, if he sees an American label on the goods he is more apt to buy the goods with the American label than goods with a foreign label, feeling that in the American product he gets a pure product and not an inferior one. I, too, feel that the committee is to be congratulated for its action in bringing out this bill. It should be passed unanimously.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The vast majority of American exporters are heartily in agreement with the purposes of this bill; there are only a few who do not comply already.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 801 (d)), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) No proceeding shall be instituted under section 302, 303, or 304 based on an allegation that an article which has been produced for export is adulterated or misbranded if—

"(1) such article is labeled on the outside of the shipping package with the name and address of the foreign consignee or the words 'For export';

"(2) such alleged adulteration or misbranding exists solely (A) by reason of the fact that such article is not labeled in the English language, if it is labeled in the language of the country to which such article is intended for export, or (B) by reason of compliance with a requirement established by or pursuant to the law of such country, or (C) by reason of noncompliance with a quantitative requirement in any standard established or recognized by or under section 401, 501 (b), 506, or 507, if a different but corresponding requirement with which such article complies, has been established or is

recognized by or under the law of such country;

"(3) in cases referred to in subclause (B) or (C) of clause (2) of this subsection, the exporter, prior to the production of such article, obtains an authenticated copy of the currently applicable provisions of such law, or of such requirement, upon which the exporter relies; and

"(4) such exporter keeps such authenticated copy and makes it available for copying by any officer or employee of the agency on his request at any reasonable hour until 3 years after any export shipment is made to which such authenticated copy relates. But if such article is sold or offered for sale in domestic commerce, this subsection shall not exempt it from any of the provisions of this act."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "801" and insert "331."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "has been produced" and insert "is exported or delivered."

Page 2, line 2, insert "and" after the semicolon; and in line 4, strike out "solely"; and in line 10, strike out "quantitative requirement in any"; and in lines 12 and 13, strike out "requirement" and insert "standard"; and in line 15, strike out "country;" and insert "country or is prescribed by a pharmacopoeia in general use in such country."; and strike out beginning with line 16, page 2, down through line 2, page 3.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REHABILITATION OF THE SISSETON-WAHPETON SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3765) to promote the rehabilitation of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Sisseton Reservation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this seems to be a very meritorious bill and one that I hope Congress will pass. It involves entirely too much money, however, to be considered on the Consent Calendar. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important measure and I think the author of the bill should explain it to the House.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished author of this bill is necessarily absent from the House this morning. I would be very glad to make a brief explanation.

Some years ago when the Farm Resettlement Authorization Act was passed, an organization which subsequently be-

came the Farm Security Administration, those agencies acquired considerable acreage of land in the United States, mostly for the purpose of subdivision for sale to tenant farmers. In most cases the land was subdivided and sold to individual farmers but the Government retained the mineral rights in the land. The result is that there are hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land in different parts of the country where the farmer owns the surface of the land but the Government retains the mineral rights. This bill provides that where it is apparent to the Department of Agriculture that there is no market value to these mineral rights, that is, where there has been no mining, and no effort is being made to develop any minerals, the mineral rights shall be conveyed to the present owner of the surface of the land for \$1 in order that the mineral rights and the title to the land may go together. It provides that wherever there is evidence of valuable mineral rights the Secretary shall make an investigation and shall sell the mineral rights at what he believes them to be worth. He shall determine their value and they shall be sold at the fair market value. The general purpose of the bill is to transfer to the owners of the surface of these farms the mineral rights which the Government acquired with the land, for which it did not pay one penny, and which it did not transfer when it sold the land. The Government acquired the land for the purpose of resettlement and solely to preserve and improve the agricultural value. This gets the mineral title back into the holders of the fee.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What I want to know is who is entitled to the minerals in the land?

Mr. PACE. The bill provides it must be sold to a private person who now owns the title to the surface of the land.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. My interest comes from the fact that many farms belong to the Federal land bank in the West. When the farmer lost title to his land to the land bank by foreclosure, the Federal land bank permitted him to rent the land and stay on it, then when times improved they let him buy it back but reserved the mineral rights. Hundreds of farms are producing oil but the man who owns the land, the man who pays the taxes, gets nothing out of it. Outsiders bought the oil rights, are producing oil and receiving the benefits. The man who developed the farm, who pays the taxes, is now out the oil. Through a harassing license clause with the Federal land bank. I want to know if that is the plan being followed by this bill.

Mr. PACE. All I can say about this bill is there is not anything in it that would benefit a previous owner of the land. The bill provides that the sale shall be made to the private person who at the time of the application is the owner of the surface of the land.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that only the man who owns the surface of the land is qualified to buy the mineral rights, I withdraw my objection. If any outsider can come in and take the mineral rights, then I would have to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to sell, as hereinafter provided, all mineral interests now owned by the United States, which have been reserved or acquired by it under any program heretofore administered by the Resettlement Administration, or the Farm Security Administration, or now administered by the Farmers Home Administration, except the program administered pursuant to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the program for the liquidation of labor camps pursuant to Public Law 298, Elgthieth Congress.

Sec. 2. Such mineral interests shall be sold only to private persons who shall apply therefor and who at the time of application are the owners of the surface of the land covered by the application. Applicants shall establish their title to the surface of the land covered by the application to the satisfaction of the Secretary at their own expense. Conveyances of mineral interests shall be by quitclaim deed executed by the Secretary or his delegate.

Sec. 3. In areas where the Secretary determines there is no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application shall be sold for a consideration of \$1. In other areas the mineral interests shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate. Area determinations made by the Secretary pursuant to this section may be revised from time to time and the consideration to be obtained for the mineral interests in connection with any particular tract of land shall be determined by the rule applicable to the area in which the tract is located at the time of the application therefor.

Sec. 4. The Secretary is directed to authorize the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell and convey the mineral interests heretofore or hereafter acquired by it in conformity with the policy expressed in this act with respect to the mineral interests described in section 1 hereof.

Sec. 5. All proceeds from sales made under this act of mineral interests described in section 1 hereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the proceeds from sales of mineral interests which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations shall be credited to the appropriate corporation account.

Sec. 6. The Secretary may make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 7. No application for the purchase of mineral interests under this act shall be filed until 90 days after this act becomes effective.

Sec. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "determines" insert "after consultation with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities that."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SECOND DE-
CONTROL ACT OF 1947 WITH RESPECT
TO TIN AND TIN PRODUCTS**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5044) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion in respect to tin and tin products conferred upon the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the situation is. When I agree to a unanimous-consent request for consideration, it is understood, and by implication it is understood I assume by every other Member, that the bill is going to go through with the committee amendments. If any amendment is offered it is only after consultation with the committee. It seems to me the purpose of the Consent Calendar is being abused if everyone of us sits here and gives consent, then suddenly an amendment is offered and a fight is precipitated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As far as the objectors on this side of the aisle are concerned, if we know in advance an amendment is going to be offered and we are not favorable to the amendment, we would object to the consideration of the bill. Not knowing an amendment was going to be offered, not having been consulted about it, we are not objecting; otherwise we might. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. All of these amendments should be first submitted to the objectors on both the Democratic and Republican sides. A bill came up for consideration a while ago. The gentleman from New York offered an amendment which had not been submitted to the objectors on this side of the aisle. Had it been submitted we might have had some objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. When this bill was put on the Consent Calendar I thought there would be no objection to it. It was not a controversial bill. It was passed by the committee without going into executive session.

After that the Secretary of Agriculture wanted the bill to be amended to include fats and oils and rice products. We had a meeting of the committee this morning and there was a good deal of controversy in regard to this amendment. I told one of the objectors on the other side that an amendment would be offered. I thought I would notify him in advance. After we had the meeting I told the objectors there would be no amendments offered to the bill. Now I ask the gentleman to withdraw offering

his proposed amendment because it will mean that the bill will not be passed.

We are going to consider his amendment. The Secretary of Agriculture is very much interested in it, but I hope it will not be offered to this bill because it would violate the agreement I had.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill that has been reported out is a very important one and it is necessary to get it passed immediately.

Mr. SPENCE. The authority expires on June 30.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman offers his amendment it will only embarrass the situation.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I think I can say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the passage of this amendment today is just as important, if not more important, than the passage of the bill which it seeks to amend.

The situation is this: This is the 20th day of June. During the war and in 1946, 1947, and 1948 the Department of Agriculture paid a high price to secure an increased production of flax in order that there might be an adequate supply of linseed oil. Your Government now has on hand 20,000,000 bushels of flax in which it has an investment of about \$6 a bushel. Our great neighbor to the north has about 11,000,000 bushels of flax ready to move into the United States on the 1st day of July. The Argentine has in seed or oil equivalent to about 38,000,000 bushels. That will break the price at least \$1, if not \$2, on the 20,000,000 bushels owned by the Government. The Argentine during the war, although it had flax, proposed to sell it to us at \$9 a bushel. Rather than submit to that price the program in the United States was put into effect. Therefore, if this amendment is not offered to this bill and adopted it is calculated to cost your Government between \$20,000,000 and \$50,000,000. Nobody in this country is more interested in the adoption of this amendment than the Secretary of Agriculture. Now it is proposed that at a later date, maybe during the week, some consideration will be given to this amendment by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I respectfully submit that time does not permit the consideration of two bills extending the war powers as regards to imports.

The bill before you relates only to tin, extending the power controlling the import of tin into the United States. The amendment I have offered in behalf of the distinguished chairman of my committee, who is necessarily absent and, I believe, in behalf of the majority of the members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and I know in keeping with the wishes of the Secretary of Agriculture, is to simply say that if you are going to temporarily extend the power to control the imports of tin you shall at the same time continue the controls on the imports of fats and oils and the particular item at stake, which is flax. That is the situation.

I think I would be derelict in my duty, certainly at the moment as acting chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if I did not submit to you this amendment and this explanation of the situation and appeal to you, if no more than for the saving of \$20,000,000 to \$50,000,000, that you put this amendment on the bill and let it go to the Senate along with the bill. Somebody has intimated to me that maybe the paint people would object. I do not know, but I know that your Government has spent millions and millions and millions of dollars in order to increase the production of flax in order that the paint people might have linseed oil for their paints. I do not believe that the paint people of this Nation, after their Government has supplied them with the linseed oil they need, would now come in and object to saving our Government twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty million dollars by not letting these imports flood into this country.

I am told that at this hour there is an enormous world surplus of flax, and if we vote down this amendment, in my judgment you will just have unwittingly contributed to an expenditure of somewhere between \$25,000,000 and \$50,000,000. The only thing that is important is time. If you think that the Committee on Banking and Currency at some later date can get consideration of this bill under a rule or that it can be passed on the Consent Calendar, it will be too late. It cannot be passed on the next suspension day, because it will be too late. If you think the Committee on Banking and Currency can have a hearing and get this bill on the floor and get it passed and to the other body and passed there before midnight of June 30, then vote against the amendment.

But if you see that there is a real danger of these things not happening, then in behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture, and in behalf of the Treasury of the United States, I appeal to you to support this amendment. That is the reason it is offered.

I regret that the distinguished Democratic leader feels that it should not be considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says about his regrets concerning the distinguished Democratic leader does not concern me in this discussion. I am standing for the regular order. The gentleman has made reference to the paint business. I do not know anything about the paint business.

Mr. PACE. I do not, either.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the information was that somebody objected because of the paint business. The Secretary of Agriculture has not talked to me, and neither has the President, but he has talked to me about the bill pending. It seems to me that when bills are brought up on the Consent Calendar, it is understood that when consent is granted the bill will go through as reported out by the committee, and every Member is justified in assuming that. And that only committee amendments will go in or other amendments will be taken up with the committee and the committee will agree to them first.

I have never offered an amendment yet, but what I have taken it up with the committee. That last one I offered I discussed with the chairman and then when there was objection I withdrew it rather than subject the House to the uncomfortable situation of having a fight precipitated. I am asking that the regular procedure be followed here. If the gentleman wants to take the responsibility of delaying this bill, unless he gets his amendment, then the gentleman will have to take that responsibility, because the amendment is not before the House at the present time and cannot be until the unanimous consent of the House is granted for the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. Unanimous consent has not been granted for the consideration of this bill and the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. McCormack] has the floor on a reservation of objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCormack. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. After the colloquy had with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts about taking up amendments with the committee of objectors on the Consent Calendar, in fairness to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Spence], I want to say that he called me on the telephone. I believe this is the bill he referred to and he said that an amendment might be offered. Since the discussion has arisen here on the floor, we have been given copies of the proposed amendment and so far as the official objectors on this side of the aisle are concerned, we have no objection to the consideration of the amendment at this time. In fact, we think it is a meritorious amendment provided that it does not interfere with the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCormack. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting of the committee this morning. Before we had that meeting I called up some of the objectors on the other side and told them that this amendment would be offered. Afterwards there was some objection raised to it and I told them it would not be offered. I feel that I have to carry out my promise, so far as I am concerned, unless they relieve me of that promise. I think the matter of my good faith and fair dealing is involved. None of these arguments have any effect upon me as long as that promise was made to the committee. I believe it is the duty of the chairman of the committee, who introduced the bill and asked for its consideration by unanimous consent to tell the committee if any material amendments would be made to it. Since we had the meeting this morning I told the Secretary of Agriculture that no action would be taken on the amendment today; that we would have hearings on the bill and would endeavor to report it out at the earliest possible moment. That is the status of the case now. I have no objection to the amendment. I have no

doubt the committee will report a bill and I have no doubt it will report it in time for it to be considered. But unless the objectors on the other side release me from the promise I made to them, I will be compelled to vote against that amendment now.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We did release the gentleman a moment ago when I said that we have no objection to the amendment being considered at this time.

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia this question. If permission is granted does he intend to offer his amendment? If he does, I shall object. I will take the responsibility of doing that. The gentleman has the promise that the committee will hear him, and he has my assurance that if the bill is reported, I will cooperate as I always have. I have even spoken for peanuts.

Mr. PACE. What has that to do with this situation?

Mr. McCormack. I say that just to show my cooperation. This is a different proposition now.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCormack. I yield.

Mr. PACE. As I said, I am not personally interested in flax. I have never seen a flaxseed in my life, that I know of. The only thing I am doing is trying to serve my committee and the chairman of my committee. For the moment at least I am constrained to say that if the bill is up for consideration, I will be required to offer the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCormack. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency feel that his committee can handle this matter expeditiously?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. I think the Secretary of Agriculture made a mistake when he sent it to the other committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

POLICING OF THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING AND GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4948) relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that in this particular bill if a constituent of mine happens to step on the grass of the Supreme Court grounds he is liable to a fine of \$100 or imprisonment for 60 days. I wonder if section 2 is not rather picayunish and nonessential to the real purpose and intent of the bill.

I think unless this bill can be amended so as to remove particularly objectionable items, and reduce it to the purpose for which it is supposed to be, I shall be forced to ask that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BRYSON. I would like to make a very brief explanation as to the necessity and the importance of this bill.

Since time immemorial the guards or special police officers in and around the Supreme Court Building have been functioning under commissions granted to them by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Under some interpretation of the legal staff of the District Commissioners, they have reached the conclusion that they do not have authority to commission officers to guard the Supreme Court Building and its immediate environments. As a result, the entire Supreme Court went into conference and this bill was really drawn at the suggestion of if not actually by the members of the Supreme Court.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will please read section 2 of the bill, it states as follows:

Public travel in and occupancy of the Supreme Court grounds is hereby restricted to the sidewalks and other paved surfaces.

Under section 8 the penalty for violating section 2 is a fine of \$100 or 60 days in jail. To me it looks more or less like blue laws that were passed some 200 years ago rather than at this supposedly enlightened age. Unless the gentleman will take section 2 out of the bill, together with the portion of section 4 which makes it unlawful to step upon the turf of these particular grounds, I shall personally have to object, much as I dislike to disagree with the committee and with the gentleman.

Mr. BRYSON. I am sure, knowing the gentleman as I do, that he would know the Supreme Court would be as reasonable about these matters as the Commissioners have been or as the police officers have been. Since I have been in Congress I remember seeing pickets marching in and around the Supreme Court Building.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not object to section 6, concerning which the gentleman is speaking, but I do object to these people who happen to step upon the grass, without knowing of such a penalty, being subject to this penalty. Everyone who makes such a mistake is liable to a fine of \$100 or being put in jail for 60 days. It does not seem reasonable to me, nor necessary to the real purpose behind this legislation.

Mr. BRYSON. I am sure the gentleman knows that similar provisions are written into the law protecting the Capitol and its grounds. I have not heard of any flagrant restrictions on the part of any legitimate use of the building or grounds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no further need for discussion. Until the bill can be brought back from the committee with these particular objections removed, I am forced to regretfully object. Therefore, I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4800

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 21 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Sec-
4 retary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secre-
5 tary") is authorized and directed to sell, as hereinafter
6 provided, all mineral interests now owned by the United
7 States, which have been reserved or acquired by it under
8 any program heretofore administered by the Resettlement
9 Administration, or the Farm Security Administration, or now
10 administered by the Farmers Home Administration, except
11 the program administered pursuant to title III of the Bank-

1 head-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the program
2 for the liquidation of labor camps pursuant to Public Law
3 298, Eightieth Congress.

4 SEC. 2. Such mineral interests shall be sold only to pri-
5 vate persons who shall apply therefor and who at the time
6 of application are the owners of the surface of the land
7 covered by the application. Applicants shall establish their
8 title to the surface of the land covered by the application
9 to the satisfaction of the Secretary at their own expense.
10 Conveyances of mineral interests shall be by quitclaim deed
11 executed by the Secretary or his delegate.

12 SEC. 3. In areas where the Secretary determines after
13 consultation with the Department of the Interior and com-
14 petent local authorities that there is no active mineral de-
15 velopment or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a
16 single application shall be sold for a consideration of \$1.
17 In other areas the mineral interests shall be sold at the fair
18 market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after
19 taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems neces-
20 sary or appropriate. Area determinations made by the Sec-
21 retary pursuant to this section may be revised from time to
22 time and the consideration to be obtained for the mineral
23 interests in connection with any particular tract of land shall

1 be determined by the rule applicable to the area in which
2 the tract is located at the time of the application therefor.

3 SEC. 4. The Secretary is directed to authorize the Fed-
4 eral Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell and convey the
5 mineral interests heretofore or hereafter acquired by it in
6 conformity with the policy expressed in this Act with
7 respect to the mineral interests described in section 1 hereof.

8 SEC. 5. All proceeds from sales made under this Act
9 of mineral interests described in section 1 hereof shall be
10 covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscel-
11 laneous receipts, except that the proceeds from sales of
12 mineral interests which were a part of or derived from the
13 assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with
14 State rural rehabilitation corporations shall be credited to
15 the appropriate corporation account.

16 SEC. 6. The Secretary may make such rules and regu-
17 lations and such delegations of authority as he may deem
18 necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

19 SEC. 7. No application for the purchase of mineral
20 interests under this Act shall be filed until ninety days after
21 this Act becomes effective.

22 SEC. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated to the
23 Secretary such sums as Congress may from time to time

- 1 determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
- 2 out the provisions of this Act.

Passed the House of Representatives June 20, 1949.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

JUNE 21 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry



(This current circulation has been discontinued.)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MINERAL INTERESTS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 75TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, 1917, HOUSE REPORT NO. 1000, PAGES 1-10.

Senators Ellender, Gillette, Coughart, Sen. and Tye were present. The following House members were present and presented statements supporting H. R. 4800: Cather, Gathings, Gossett, Ireland, Wilson, Christopher.

Mr. Gossett objected to the provision in H. R. 4800 as passed by the House which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with the Department of Interior in determining areas in which there is no active mineral development or leasing on the grounds that it was unnecessary and would merely add expense and confusion. When questioned by Senator Ellender, other Congressmen present did not agree with Mr. Gossett on this point.

Sen. Ellender said that the Committee had received a favorable report on H. R. 4800, the Senate companion to H. R. 4800, from this Department with the recommendation that it be amended to provide that title to any mineral interests not sold at the end of five years would be transferred to the Department of the Interior. In answer to a question by Sen. Ellender, I said I did not think the Department would object to a reasonable increase in the length of this period.

Mr. Lasseter, PMA, and Mr. Colvin, PCA, testified in favor of the bill. The Committee agreed with Mr. Colvin that the bill would not require proceeds from the sale of mineral rights by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to be covered into the Treasury of the U. S. but that these should be handled the same as other corporation receipts.

Sen. Gillette expressed concern that speculators might reap a windfall under the provisions of the bill by acquiring title to surface rights thereby becoming eligible to acquire the mineral rights and indicated that he will seek an amendment to require that the surface rights must have been owned for some reasonable period of time by the applicant for the mineral rights. Representative Gossett and others expressed opposition to such a provision.

Marion Clawson, Director, Bureau of Land Management, said the Department of the Interior has no objection to the bill if amended as proposed by this Department.

H. A. Backus
Office of the Secretary

Not for quotation or other reference without specific authorization of this Division
In cooperation with this Division.





AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The bill (S. 2872) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should very much appreciate an explanation of the purposes of the bill and the need for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under existing law, the War Claims Commission is required to file a report with the President, for transmission to Congress, by March 31, 1950, covering the scope of the problem of war claims and recommendations as to the nature of claims which should be received. It was the intention of the Congress that this report should be the basis for possible future legislation.

Because the War Claims Commission was delayed in being activated, it is contended the deadline for this report comes too early. Members of the War Claims Commission appeared before the committee and urged an extension, and the committee felt that an extension of 3 months was reasonable. This bill provides that the report shall be filed not later than June 30, 1950.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "January 3, 1951" and insert "'June 30, 1950'." so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 8, Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress, approved July 3, 1948, as amended, be further amended by striking out the words "March 31, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GEORGETTE PONSARD

The bill (S. 2443) for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 78) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9573888, Albertsen, Erik Albertus, or Erik Albertus Albertson.

A-4769516, Aney, Herbert Augustus.

A-5884356, Andor, Frank, or Francisc Andor.

A-6007541, Avalos, Jesus Flores.

A-4874684, Bailey, William Nathaniel.

A-6447786, Balot, Francisco.

A-5067439, Barker, Ethel (nee Beesley).

A-4084313, Barton, Beatrice Ethel Gwendolyn (nee Linton, formerly Demarest).

A-6790371, Basarow, Eduard.

A-1670554, Bolkos, Alexandros, or Aleck or Alex Bolkos.

A-6920650, Borowicz, Jeannine, or Jeanine Borowicz.

A-6200606, Bradley, Dominga (nee Hipolito).

A-4198712, Brodauf, Lina Agnes (nee Pohler).

A-4812080, Brokos, Georgios or George.

A-6354831, Burgess, Mary Fraser (nee Fraser).

A-6838464, Camarena-Limon, Pedro, or Jose or Pedro Kliman.

A-4545624, Campbell, Allan George.

A-5618539, Candela, Filippo, or Vincenzo Di Bella or Phillip Candela.

A-4668883, Candela, Providenza (nee Providenza Di Bella).

A-6268383, Caracostis, Evangelos.

A-6227082, Cardaris, Catherine or Katherine (nee Glavas).

A-6688784, Cazabon, John Charles.

A-6868119, Chavez-Perez, Venancio.

A-5959131, Christlan, Hilda Juanita.

A-3134485, Christoff, Stoina.

A-7632246, Chung, Sylvia Ssu-Yi Liang, or Sylvia Chang nee Liang or Chang Liang Ssu-Yi or Ssu-Yi Liang or Chung.

A-6172766, Collios, Hariklia, or Hariklia Gallinis or Hariklia Pappanicolaou.

A-6439042, Connell Dalia Philomena, or Dalla or Dahlia Magetti.

A-3208736, Coray, Claudine Helene (nee Wiesmann).

A-6754556, Crisan, John George Julius, or Ioan Gheorghe Iuliu Crisan.

A-6700029, Chistobal, Juan Urbino, or Johnny or Chris Cristobal.

A-4034158, Crovetto, Andrea, or Andrew Crovetto.

A-6838471, Cruz, Guillermo.

A-6817782, Cruz-Ortega, Narcizo.

A-3919865, De Caballero, Luisa Guerra.

A-4988558, De Carpio, Teresa Torralva, or Teresa Falcon or Teresa Falcon Zamora or Teresa Torralva or Teresa Torralva De Zamora.

A-3016147, De Luca, Stanislao, or Stanley De Luca.

A-7626818, De McClure, Griselda James.

A-4518676, Discart, Marie Morren.

A-2530651, Dmitrasinovich, Stojan Bude, or Steve Dmitrich.

A-5735677, De Duarte, Adela Leon.

A-6768535, Duggan, Linda Jane Rosa.

A-3948402, Dunne, Hop Hee.

A-6688424, Ebanks, George Robert.

A-6455581, Eugenios, Markos.

A-6482570, Farkas, Armln.

A-6743248, Farnes, George Theodore, or George T. Farnes.

A-5532334, Finkel, Samuel Abraham.

A-6903401, Fisher, Josephine Thelma.

A-6742832, Frugone, Oretta Caterina, or Oretta Frugone Kuwana.

A-2680057, Gam, Moi Nguk, or Nguk Gam Moi.

A-6095599, Gee, Quan Dong, or Quan Yew Moon.

A-5501035, Gentile, Atanasio.

A-4126913, George, Eduardo, or Eppoletta Edward George.

A-4702644, Giannopoulos, Christos Lazarou or Yankopoulos.

A-6198514, Gladych, Boleslaw Michael, or Michael Gladych.

A-2896461, Gomez, Domingo Garcia, or Domingo Garcia.

A-6798463, Gonzales-Cardenas, Santana.

A-6877467, Gonzalez-Quintero, Inez.

A-5634981, Goranson, Carl Emil.

A-6425998, Grant, Herman Josiah.

A-4386180, Green, Sarah (nee Marshall or Edelstein).

A-5596701, Greenberg-Shaffer, Rachel, or Rachel Shaffer-Greenberg (nee Brott).

A-6921390, Gulgli, Doriana Mary.

A-4980618, Guzman, Marla Modesta Cancholla, or Marla Cancholla Munoz or Modesta Marla Cancholla Silva.

A-4957912, Haberl, Max (alias Walter Schoen or Max Walter Schoen).

A-1854073, Hcras, Vasillos John.

A-5505487, Hcrman, Pesia Gitkis.

A-6878607, Hong-Tuan, Dominique, Anne Marie.

A-5444715, Honlg, Paul (alias Paul Hoenig, alias Hoenig, alias Hoenig, alias Paul Montefiore).

A-6018692, Hudzlec, Ernest Rudolph.

A-6018691, Hudzlec Hcdwig (nee Jadwiga Kumecko).

A-6781685, Hughes, Desmond Connell.

A-6280991, Jahrbium, Bella, (nee Reichen-thal, alias Bella Heart, alias Blanche Heart).

A-6280992, Jahrbium, Herz Naftali (alias Henry Norman Heart).

A-6860811, Jaquez, Manuel, or Manuel Jaquez Martinez.

A-5133704, Jorgensen, Peter Gunerius.

A-1126695, Joseph, Freidrich, or Josef Deutsch.

A-2679918, Kalomaris, Gerasimos Peter, or Jerry Kalomaris.

A-3650178, Karalis, Chresantho or Chrs-anthe (nee Chrysantho John Kosmethes).

A-2127097, Katorsky, Hugo Ernest.

A-4042289, Kindness, Christina (nee Gunn).

A-5065236, Kontacostas, Kostas, or Gus Kontos.

A-6897613, Kudszus, Wolfgang Peter, or Peter Kudszus.

A-7577098, Kui, Ng.

A-6753353, Law, Fred, or Law Fook or Fook Law.

A-7589792, Lawrence, Percy James, or Cyril Lawrence.

A-3827794, Lee, Chin Shee, or Lee Fung Thin or Chin Leu Gay or Shin Wal King.

A-1492567, Lopez, Rafael Duarte, or Rafael Lopez-Duarte or Rafael Lopez or Raphael Lopez or Ralph Lopez.

A-6815956, Low, Phyllis Eva (nee Eng or Sue Yook Eng).

A-5623265, Luehr, Walter Adolph Georg.

A-6458411, Luppi, Enrico.

A-6458423, Luppi, Giovanni.

A-6498267, Lyden, Hazel Mae (nee Chunn).

A-2047098, Lyras, Stavros Aristides.

A-1545542, Maisus, Jewel.

A-6210531, Martinez-Rivera, Juvenal, or Juan Martinez.

A-7523598, Mau, Wei-Hui Huang, or Wei-Hui Huang.

A-5755020, Medovich, Ralph or Antonio or Anthony.

A-4720871, Mendez, Jesus Valdez.

A-4588008, Mithalopoulos, Nicholas, or Nicholas Michalopoulos.

A-2280169, Monasterio-Sagasti, Leon, or Leon Monasterio or Sagasti Leon Monasterio.

A-6868195, Montelongo-Gonzalez, Santiago.

A-6458231, Murillo, Manuel, or Manuel Sermenio.

A-9690675, Nagtegaal, Johannes Christiaan.

A-2387838, Nahm, Alice.

A-5901303, Nahm, Doris.

A-2387837, Nahm, Jakob, or Jacob Nahm.

A-3478388, Neisloss, Jecheskilis, or Ezekiel Schloss or Ezekiel or E. Schloss.

A-5520936, Nicholas, Demetrius, or James Nicholas Samaras.

A-5874844, Palero, Raffaele, or Ralph Polera (alias Frank Ciraco).

A-4382193, Papadopoulos, Stalios, or Stylianos or Papazoulos, Stanley, or Papas or Pappas, Steve.

A-2103213, Pashalis, Anthony Demetrios.

A-6083580, Pauly, Anabelle Jane.

A-6083578, Pauly, Catalina Aviles.

A-6083579, Pauly, Howard John.

A-6759939, Percel, Henry Oliver.

A-2105178, Petrecca, Glanni (John), or Giovain Petric.

A-7005288, Pistolakis, Nicholas Stelianos.
 A-6362653, Plasencia-Ortega, Ernesto (also Ernest Plasencia).
 A-6286715, Porras, Reyes.
 A-1666793, Puccioni, Otello, or Nino Gini or Adolfo Dovicchi.
 A-4921273, Pulido-Estrada, Martin.
 A-4528502, Quong, Rose, or Quong Ru-Ssu.
 A-1298028, Reid, Joseph George Menzie.
 A-5185918, Reid, Reginald Sinclair.
 A-5453164, Rendon-Benavides, Olaya.
 A-6435783, Rivas, Carmen Natalia.
 A-6428426, Rivas, Josefina Elena.
 A-6428425, Rivas, Jr., Victor Manuel.
 A-4395188, Rod, Olaf, Martinson.
 A-5151512, Ruppert, David, or Davidas Rapoportas or David Rapaport.
 A-6827870, Rusciano, Constantino.
 A-6774663, Salaney, Dorothy Augusta.
 A-6924331, Salovardos, Stamatios Konstantinos.
 A-4604542, Sapata, Alfredo De Pinho, or Alfredo Pinho Sapata.
 A-9801198, Saul, Lembit.
 A-5435509, Schanabel, August Josef.
 A-5524716, Scopetani, Luigi.
 A-6016388, Seleman, George.
 A-1489980, Shultz, Charles, or Karls Alksne or Karlis Alksinis.
 A-1552469, Silva, Leandro Tavares, or Leandro Tavares or Leandro Silva or Leandro Tavo.
 A-6245223, Skias, Maria (nee Misigi or Maria G. Skias or Maria J. Missigi).
 A-6716198, Simmonds, Claude Hubert.
 A-5953790, Simmonds, Leona.
 A-4343933, Stamatou, Constantinos.
 A-2823759, Stratis, John Stefanos.
 A-6928185, Theofiles, Nicholas George, or Nick George Theofiles.
 A-2252841, Torbarina, Sam, or Sime Torbarino.
 A-3164059, Tountasakis, Nicolaos, or Nick or Nicholas Tountasakis or Nick Totisikis.
 A-4506013, Tracy, George Courtenay.
 A-6756001, Trujillo, Lilliane Maria (nee Medina).
 A-1996713, Tsagaris, Evangelos, or Angelo Twagris.
 A-5047368, Tsolainos, Theodore Panagiotis.
 A-4492389, Ulfers, Frederick Adolf Emil (alias Frederick Ulfers alias Frederick Schaefer).
 A-3309666, Ullah, Joban, or Abdul Aziz.
 A-6324738, Urzua-Lopez, Manuel, or Miguel Urzua-Lopez.
 A-2478333, Valino, Manuel Romay.
 A-5244850, Varela, Roman Pardo, or Ramon Pardo Varela or Raymond Pardo Varela or Varela.
 A-6990518, Velarde, Juana.
 A-7787924, Viada, Angel Gabriel Patricio or Gimenez.
 A-7787904, Viada, Pilar (nee Fernandez, also known as Berman and Ferrer).
 A-3487602, Wagner, Eddie, or Andrzej Zielas or Andrew Zielas.
 A-4961294, Wegner, Max John.
 A-6855170, Zambrano-Serrano, Carlos.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over at this time. I am not sure I have objection to it, but there is some information I should like to obtain.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have prepared a short statement in explanation of the bill. I headed the subcommittee which considered the matter and

went into it very thoroughly. There are quite a few Senators interested in the bill because it covers land in 38 different States. The bill seeks to establish a policy, which I shall explain. Will the Senator withhold his objection for a while?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I withhold my objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, House bill 4800 establishes a nationally sound, equitable, and uniform policy for transferring Government-reserved mineral rights to the present landowners. I desire to point out to Senators that the measure relates only to mineral rights retained by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the disposal of farm lands acquired pursuant to agricultural improvement and agricultural credit programs. Lands purchased under title 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act and permanently retired from production, and lands acquired pursuant to the laws permitting the liquidation of wartime labor camps, are specifically excluded.

This proposed legislation has been prompted by the following history: Prior to 1946, certain agricultural lands were acquired by two Government agencies, the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration; these lands were acquired for resale to farmers. They were sold with all or a major part of the minerals reserved to the Government. Moreover, during this period a Government-owned corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed the same policy in disposing of agricultural lands which it had acquired in the course of its farm lending operations. With, however, the enactment of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, the policy was changed by the Congress with respect to the disposal by the Agriculture Department of farm lands of the type I have mentioned.

In other words, in all Government sales after 1946 the persons who purchased the land acquired all the mineral rights. The purpose of the present measure is simply to put all farm owners, or people who purchase that land in the same category. That is all the bill seeks to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement I prepared on House bill 4800 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINERAL RIGHTS BILL, H. R. 4800

Mr. President, H. R. 4800, establishes a nationally sound, equitable and uniform policy for transferring Government-reserved mineral rights to the present landowners. I desire to point out to Senators that the measure relates only to mineral rights retained by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the disposal of farm lands acquired pursuant to agricultural improvement and agricultural credit programs. Lands purchased under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act and permanently retired from production, and lands acquired pursuant to the laws permitting the liquidation of wartime labor camps, are specifically excluded.

This proposed legislation has been prompted by the following history: Prior to 1946, certain agricultural lands were ac-

quired by two Government agencies, the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration; these lands were acquired for resale to farmers. They were sold with all or a major part of the minerals reserved to the Government. Also during this period a Government-owned corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed the same policy in disposing of agricultural lands which it had acquired in the course of its farm-lending operations. With, however, the enactment of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, the policy was changed by the Congress with respect to the disposal by the Agriculture Department of farm lands of the type I have mentioned. In this latter connection, Mr. President, section 9 of the 1946 Farmers Home Administration Act provides that: "Any conveyance of real estate by the Government or any Government agency under this chapter shall include the mineral rights." Thus the Farmers Home Administration, successor to the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration, now follows the policy of divesting the Government's ownership in the minerals as well as the surface rights whenever farm lands acquired under certain agricultural programs are resold to farmers. Recently the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, in disposing of mineral interests reserved by it in the course of its farm-finance operations, has been following essentially the same policy as is incorporated in the bill now before us.

The pending legislation, Mr. President, seeks only to grant relief to those farmers who, under the agricultural programs I have just mentioned, purchased lands prior to 1946 from the Department of Agriculture and from the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. H. R. 4800 will enable these farmers to obtain ownership of all minerals under their lands, and thereby will put them in the same status as farmers who acquired lands after passage of the 1946 act. This bill does not give the mineral rights to the present landowners; it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell these rights to the landowners, upon receipt of their written applications. In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is no active mineral development or leasing, the bill establishes a nominal sale price of \$1 per application; in areas where there is active mineral development and leasing, the mineral interests shall be sold at "the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate." The bill further provides that in determining whether or not there is active mineral development in an area, the Secretary shall consult with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities.

In this measure, Mr. President, the burden is placed on the present landowner to make application to the Secretary of Agriculture for conveyance of the mineral interests. Only private persons who, at the time of the application, are owners of the surface of the land may apply, and the landowner must establish title to the surface ownership at his own expense.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in reporting this legislation favorably, has recommended that the bill be amended to provide that if any mineral interests covered by this measure have not been disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture within 7 years from the effective date of the legislation, or within 7 years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests by the United States, whichever date is the later, title to such mineral interests shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for administration under the applicable Federal mineral statutes. This amendment was recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, but with a 5-year time limitation; however, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry recommended the 7-year period in the bill now before the Senate.

All proceeds of mineral interests sales authorized under this bill are to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. An exception is made in the case of proceeds from sales of mineral interests which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations. These receipts shall be credited to the appropriate corporation account. Likewise, proceeds from sales of mineral interests by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are to remain in the Corporation. I might state that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is wholly owned by the United States Government.

Section 8 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of Agriculture estimates that approximately \$65,000 will be required to administer the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, H. R. 4800 was approved by the House of Representatives on June 20, 1949. A Senate Agriculture and Forestry Subcommittee, of which I served as chairman, held open hearings on the bill last March. Representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Justice presented the views of their respective departments. The distinguished Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART, and a number of Congressmen also testified. All of the testimony received by the subcommittee was favorable to the enactment of the bill. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the measure's adoption. In a letter dated October 14, 1949, and addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with respect to a similar bill (S. 2104), the Secretary of Agriculture states as follows:

"The disposal of existing mineral interests under the administration of the Farmers Home Administration and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the best advantage of the United States is of major concern and it is urgent that this Department be given directions by the Congress for the disposal of the mineral interests. S. 2104 contains a consistent, uniform policy for the disposal of the mineral interests and would resolve the problems involved in the existing mineral interests held by these agencies. For these reasons, we recommend its immediate enactment provided the suggested amendment for transferring unsold minerals to the Department of the Interior is included."

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a worthy bill, one that is deserving of early and favorable action by the Senate. I hope that it can be approved today by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana I am inclined to think I shall agree to the bill at a later date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator consent to let the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not be able to obtain the information which I am seeking in time for that. The reason I objected to the bill at this time is that I have been given to understand that the Government acquired these mineral rights on the farm lands which it purchased, and that in selling the farm lands to the farmers again it withheld the mineral rights prior to 1946.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it has been called to my attention that certain mineral rights in oil-producing areas which they did acquire have been sold privately,

and I want to follow through those sales to know how they were handled. In other words, while the Government sold the land to the farmers, a portion of the mineral rights have since been sold privately.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the Government to certain interests. I want to check that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator is misinformed. The bill does not apply to that land at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to carry it over at this time to obtain information about that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will go over.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 10 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

The bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is a matter, Mr. President, in which I have no personal interest whatever. The Federal Reserve Board faces the necessity of building more new branches and improving some existing banking installations. We were informed that it was of very urgent necessity to increase the Board's building fund, because the Board had had no building program since before the war. The committee decided to reduce, by the substitute amendments or additional amendments reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I ask to have called up, the authorization from \$25,000,000 to \$20,000,000, and the committee places the following restrictions:

That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and, in determining the time of construction, consideration shall be given to the matter of relieving local unemployment.

The amendment reducing the amount from \$25,000,000 to \$20,000,000 and the amendment respecting restrictions, I ask to be considered. I ask the Senate's attention to the fact that the board proposes to spend its own money in this construction program. Certainly the Federal Reserve bank is doing a very wonderful job, and if it does not have banking facilities it seems to me we should authorize an amount sufficient to provide them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if what the Senator from Virginia states is all that is in the additional amendments reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency then I certainly would have no objection to the bill. I will say I have not read it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assumed my colleague would not have any objection when he heard the statement. I can assure him that is everything that is in the bill. The amendments were pro-

posed by our great economy advocate, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is on the floor, and who can give the Senator double assurance that that is all that is in the amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not necessary. The assurance of the Senator from Virginia is sufficient for me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the amendments referred to by the Senator from Virginia permit the expenditure of the money according to the needs of the Federal Reserve rather than according to the needs of the community for labor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The purpose of the substitute amendments is to change the original committee amendment, which only permitted the Board to build in order to relieve unemployment. As now amended, if the construction is absolutely needed, the Board can proceed with it, but these additional matters must be borne in mind.

Mr. BRICKER. There is now before the Senate the substitute offered by the Senator from Virginia for the measure as reported by the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The substitute was adopted by the committee. It is a committee substitute, and I accepted it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, in line 7, after the figures "\$25,000,000", to insert a semicolon and the following: "and by adding at the end of said paragraph the following: 'And provided further, That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and shall be undertaken only when it will assist in relieving local unemployment'". so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso contained in the ninth paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 522), is hereby further amended by striking out "\$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000"; and by adding at the end of said paragraph the following: "And provided further, That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and shall be undertaken only when it will assist in relieving local unemployment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first additional amendment of the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 7 it is proposed to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second of the additional amendments will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment beginning with the semicolon in line 7, it is proposed to insert the following: "and by adding at the end of said paragraph the following: 'And provided further, That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and, in determining the time of construction, consideration shall be given to the matter of relieving local unemployment.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 3105) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2943) to liberalize the lending policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of the Federal Reserve Banking System in favor of independent small-business enterprises; to adjust the registration provisions of the Securities Exchange Act, as amended, in order to enable independent small-business concerns to issue securities at a reasonable cost; to develop the productive facilities of the national economy; to further the interest of independent small-business enterprises; to provide for the appointment of a Small Business Coordinator; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEASE OF LANDS BY JOE GRAHAM POST, NO. 119, AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (H. R. 33) to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the land conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE TO GOODYEAR AIRCRAFT CORP. OF AN EASEMENT IN ARIZONA

The bill (S. 3122) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., at such locations and under such terms and conditions as he may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for sewage purposes in, over, and across a parcel of land constituting a portion of the naval air facility, Litchfield Park, Ariz., being located in Maricopa County, Ariz., acquired by the United States by deed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting by and through War Assets Administration, dated December 31, 1948, recorded in the land records of Maricopa

County, Ariz., in Docket No. 323 on pages 456 to 461, inclusive, which deed is on file in the Navy Department.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS LAND IN FORT LEWIS MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 5101) to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Washington, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon would agree to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar, until we can send word to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

ARMY INSTITUTE OF PATHOLOGY BUILDING

The bill (H. R. 6539) to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF RURAL POST-OFFICE CARRIERS FOR LONGEVITY OF SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 6553), to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural-delivery service in recognition of longevity of service, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation, particularly as to the amounts involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is here, and is a member of that committee. I assume that he can explain the bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this bill is, in effect, a validating act, designed to afford protection against an adverse ruling of the Comptroller General regarding longevity benefits to certain postal employees under Public Law 428, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

It satisfies the Comptroller General's objections. It has the unconditional approval of the Post Office Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission.

Of the estimated cost of the operation of the measure, if enacted, only \$165,000 would be added to the estimate of the cost of the longevity provisions of the present law which have been invalidated by the Comptroller General's ruling.

The bill, which was unanimously approved by the committee, would preclude a fourth-class postmaster from receiving greater longevity pay than is now received by postmasters in first-, second- and third-class offices.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the able Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not a fact that the bill merely is a validation act?

Mr. NEELY. That is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) in the case of postmasters and employees in the postal field service (except employees, other than charmen and charwomen, paid on an hourly basis and substitute and temporary rural carriers) for whom single salary or annual automatic salary grades are provided in the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), there are hereby established longevity grades A, B, and C. The rate of basic compensation of each such postmaster and employee (except postmasters at post offices of the fourth class, and charmen and charwomen paid on an hourly basis) shall be increased by \$100 per annum for each promotion to a longevity grade. The rate of basic compensation of each such postmaster at a post office of the fourth class shall be increased by 5 percent per annum for each promotion to a longevity grade. The rate of basic compensation of each such charman and charwoman shall be increased by 5 cents per hour for each promotion to a longevity grade.

(b) Each such postmaster or employee who is serving in a regular position on the date of enactment of this act or who is appointed to such a position at any time thereafter, shall be assigned to longevity grade A at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 13 years of service, to longevity grade B at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 18 years of service, and to longevity grade C at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 25 years of service.

(c) All time on the rolls of the custodial service of the Post Office Department on and after October 1, 1933, and all time on the rolls of the mail equipment shops before or after July 1, 1945, shall be considered as postal field service. In determining longevity credit for the purposes of subsection (b), there shall be credited all time on the rolls (except time on the rolls as a substitute rural carrier) in the postal field service or in the Post Office Department before or after July 1, 1945; all time on the rolls in the custodial service of the Treasury Department continuous to the date of the transfer of the employee to the custodial service of the Post Office Department in accordance with Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933; all time on the rolls as a special delivery messenger at a first-class post office before or after July 1, 1945; all time on the rolls as a clerk in a third-class post office before or after July 1, 1945, for which payment is made from authorized allowances. In the case of an officer or employee who was separated or is hereafter separated from the postal field service or from the departmental service of the Post Office Department for military duty, or to comply with a war transfer as defined by the Civil Service Commission, all time engaged in military service or service on war transfer shall be credited, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer for each year of such service. Service specified in this subsection shall be credited on the basis of one-twelfth of a year for each whole calendar month the employee has been on the rolls. All such serv-

agency or institution to any other agency or institution.

"Sec. 5016. Reports concerning offenders.

"The Director shall cause periodic examinations and reexaminations to be made of all committed youth offenders and shall report to the Division as to each such offender as the Division may require. United States probation officers and supervisory agents shall likewise report to the Division respecting youth offenders under their supervision as the Division may direct.

"Sec. 5017. Release of youth offenders.

"(a) The Division may at any time after reasonable notice to the Director release conditionally under supervision a committed youth offender. When, in the judgment of the Director, a committed youth offender should be released conditionally under supervision he shall so report and recommend to the Division.

"(b) The Division may discharge a committed youth offender unconditionally at the expiration of 1 year from the date of conditional release.

"(c) A youth offender committed under section 5010 (b) of this chapter shall be released conditionally under supervision on or before the expiration of 4 years from the date of his conviction and shall be discharged unconditionally on or before 6 years from the date of his conviction.

"(d) A youth offender committed under section 5010 (c) of this chapter shall be released conditionally under supervision not later than 2 years before the expiration of the term imposed by the court. He may be discharged unconditionally at the expiration of not less than 1 year from the date of his conditional release. He shall be discharged unconditionally on or before the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed, computed uninterruptedly from the date of conviction.

"(e) Commutation of sentence authorized by any act of Congress shall not be granted as a matter of right to committed youth offenders but only in accordance with rules prescribed by the Director with the approval of the Division.

"Sec. 5018. Revocation of Division orders.

"The Division may revoke or modify any of its previous orders respecting a committed youth offender except an order of unconditional discharge.

"Sec. 5019. Supervision of released youth offenders.

"Committed youth offenders permitted to remain at liberty under supervision or conditionally released shall be under the supervision of United States probation officers, supervisory agents appointed by the Attorney General, and voluntary supervisory agents approved by the Division. The Division is authorized to encourage the formation of voluntary organizations composed of members who will serve without compensation as voluntary supervisory agents and sponsors. The powers and duties of voluntary supervisory agents and sponsors shall be limited and defined by regulations adopted by the Division.

"Sec. 5020. Apprehension of released offenders.

"If, at any time before the unconditional discharge of a committed youth offender, the Division is of the opinion that such youth offender will be benefited by further treatment in an institution or other facility, any member of the Division may direct his return to custody or, if necessary, may issue a warrant for the apprehension and return to custody of such youth offender and cause such warrant to be executed by a United States probation officer, and appointed supervisory agent, a United States marshal, or any officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution. Upon return to custody, such youth offender shall be given an opportunity to appear before the Division

or a member thereof. The Division may then or at its discretion revoke the order of conditional release.

"Sec. 5021. Certificate setting aside conviction.

"Upon the unconditional discharge by the Division of a committed youth offender before the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed upon him, the conviction shall be automatically set aside and the Division shall issue to the youth offender a certificate to that effect.

"Sec. 5022. Applicable date.

"This chapter shall not apply to any offense committed before its enactment.

"Sec. 5023. Relationship to Probation and Juvenile Delinquency Acts.

"(a) Nothing in this chapter shall limit or affect the power of any court to suspend the imposition or execution of any sentence and place a youth offender on probation or be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provisions of chapter 231 of this title relative to probation.

"(b) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provisions of chapter 403 of this title (the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act), or limit the jurisdiction of the United States courts in the administration and enforcement of that chapter except that the powers as to parole of juvenile delinquents shall be exercised by the Division.

"Sec. 5024. Where applicable.

"This chapter shall apply in the continental United States other than the District of Columbia and Alaska."

Sec. 3. (1) When a majority of the members of the Board of Parole appointed under section 4201 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended by this act, qualify and enter upon their duties, the Board of Parole, established by that section prior to its amendment, shall cease to exist and its powers and duties shall become vested in and be exercised by the Board established by section 1 of this act.

(b) Nothing in chapter 402 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be construed as repealing or modifying the duties, power, or authority of the Board of Parole with respect to the parole of United States prisoners not held to be committed youth offenders or juvenile delinquents.

Sec. 4. Chapter 401 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof immediately after section 5001 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 5002. Advisory Corrections Council.

"There is hereby created an Advisory Corrections Council, composed of one United States circuit judge and two United States district judges designated from time to time by the Chief Justice of the United States, of one member, who shall be chairman, designated by the Attorney General, and, ex officio, of the Chairman of the Board of Parole, the Chairman of the Youth Division, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and the Chief of Probation of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. The Council shall hold stated meetings to consider problems of treatment and correction of all offenders against the United States and shall make such recommendations of the Congress, the President, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and other appropriate officials as may improve the administration of criminal justice and assure the coordination and integration of policies respecting the disposition, treatment, and correction of all persons convicted of offenses against the United States. It shall also consider measures to promote the prevention of crime and delinquency, suggest appropriate studies in this connection to be undertaken by agencies both public and private. The members of the Council shall serve without compensation but necessary travel and subsistence expenses as authorized by law shall

be paid from available appropriations of the Department of Justice."

Sec. 5. (a) The analysis of part IV of title 18 of the United States Code, immediately preceding chapter 401 of that title, is amended by inserting immediately after and underneath item "401. General Provisions * * * 5001", a new item to read as follows: "402. Federal Youth Corrections Act * * * 5005."

(b) The analysis of chapter 401 of said title 18 of the United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after and underneath item "Sec. 5001. Surrender to State authorities; expenses," a new item "Sec. 5002. Advisory Corrections Council."

AMY L. HEFINGTON

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next bill under the agreement will be stated.

The bill (S. 1529) for the relief of Amy L. Hefington was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I send to the desk an amendment which I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first question is whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 3, before the period at the end of the bill, it is proposed to add a semicolon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of salaries to civilian personnel, the sum of \$1,783.38 to Amy L. Hefington, of Balboa, C. Z., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation covering the period from July 19, 1948, to December 24, 1948, inclusive (920 hours at \$1.9384603 an hour), during which period she was, according to findings of the Department of the Army Grievance Board, wrongfully and without justification suspended and dismissed from her civilian position with the Finance Office, United States Army Caribbean, Corozal, C. Z.; *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in

connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

MRS. SIRVART ARSENIAN

The bill (H. R. 3532) for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill came up for consideration on the last call of the calendar, at which time I gave an explanation. The purpose of the bill is merely to authorize a division of the Department of Agriculture to transfer mineral rights to the owners of farms, who acquired their lands from the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration, or now administered by the Farmer's Home Administration.

As will be recalled, several years ago, through the agencies named, certain bodies of land were acquired in various parts of the country, and they were sold to farmers, the Government reserving the mineral rights. In 1946 the Congress passed an act whereby all lands could be transferred to farmers without the necessity of retaining mineral rights.

This bill tends to create a uniform policy as to the disposition of mineral rights retained by the Department of Agriculture, in that, as to all lands which had been sold by the Government formerly, and which had been acquired through the agencies heretofore named, the Government will be given the right under this bill to transfer those mineral rights. That is all the bill does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the testimony of witnesses who appeared before the committee was to the effect that prior to this time no mineral rights have been sold? Is that the testimony?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, insofar as lands administered by the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration, or now administered by the Farmer's Home Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the testimony cover all Government departments?

Mr. ELLENDER. The only department involved here was the Department of Agriculture under which the programs heretofore named were administered. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, have appeared before the committee, and have favored the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Louisiana that none have been sold by any other Government agency?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know as to other lands not in a similar category as those covered by the pending measure. As a matter of fact, there could not have been, because this is authority to sell the mineral rights as to lands formerly owned by the Resettlement Administration, or the Farm Security Administration, or now administered by the Farmers Home Administration. If the Senator remembers, soon after 1933 large areas of land were acquired by certain Government agencies, which were subdivided into farms, and those lands were sold to farmers throughout the country, the Government reserving a portion of the mineral rights. Later on, the Congress passed a law whereby certain Government agencies owning certain lands could sell them without reserving the mineral rights.

This bill has the effect of making the policy uniform, as I explained, when the bill first came up for consideration on the last previous call of the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am going to ask, with the permission of the Senator from Louisiana, that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, to be called up again later. In the meantime, perhaps we can get together.

Mr. ELLENDER. That will be agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will go to the foot of the calendar. The clerk will call the next bill.

CIGAR-WRAPPER TOBACCO TYPES 61 AND 62

The bill (S. 2980) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cigar-wrapper type 61 tobacco and cigar-wrapper type 62 tobacco was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by the two Senators from Georgia and the two Senators from Florida. It relates to the so-called wrapper-leaf type of tobacco, which on the request of the producers of such tobacco themselves, was omitted from the agricultural support program in former legislation.

There are only two areas of the Nation affected, namely, the States of Georgia and Florida, where a small amount of acreage, about 5,100 acres, is devoted to the production of this wrapper-leaf tobacco, and the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts, where a somewhat larger area, I think amounting to about 10,000 acres, produces this type of tobacco.

The reason for the request of these producers to be included at this time under the program grows out of the fact that during World War II the competing

areas in Indonesia—Java and Sumatra—were unable to bring their products into this country. As a result, the acreage in this country increased largely, in part due to an increase of the plantings of growers here, and in part due to the coming into this nation of new corporate growers belonging to the Indonesian producers. It is now the case that the offshore tobacco is again available for introduction here, which means that the acreage here will have to be reduced. Unfortunately, there is no way of reducing the acreage equitably, except by bringing this industry, which has heretofore strongly insisted that it not be included in the program, under the terms of the agricultural price-support legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This industry, as the Senator says, is conducted by a comparatively few people, including some in a certain section of Massachusetts. Some of them want the bill, some of them do not. Is it the intention, through this bill, to reduce the acreage, in order to bring the supply within the demand, and to get the Government out of the business, or will the Government constantly have to provide a subsidy?

Mr. HOLLAND. The purpose of this measure, and the only purpose, is to allow reduction of acreage, in order that the supply may conform to the demand. I may say to the Senator there are in the Connecticut Valley area, according to statements made at the hearing, only about 38 producers. There are in the Florida-Georgia area some 300 or 305 producers. The history of this whole price-support operation as to other forms of tobacco is that it has been one of the most fortunate, if not the most fortunate operation under the program, in that the Government has been able to reduce acreage and to make the production conform to market demands. I may call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Government has a peculiar stake in this business because of the tremendous revenue-paying operations of the tobacco industry to both the Federal and the State Governments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The report states that the first year of the operation of the act will cost the Government \$8,000,000, the second year \$4,000,000, with lowering costs thereafter. Does the Senator agree to those figures?

Mr. HOLLAND. Those were the best figures we could get, and I think even they are exaggerated. I think the quoted statement really means that according to the best information available, an investment of \$8,000,000 would be required the first year, and \$4,000,000 in subsequent years. But, if the Senator will read the remainder of the report, he will note that it has been the history of operations in the tobacco industry that there has been no loss to the Government. To the contrary, there has been some profit. It would be the intention, provided two-thirds or more of the producers in each area would agree to it—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

PRESTON L. WATSON, ADMINISTRATOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1056) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine on the merits, and to render in accordance therewith, judgment upon the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods, chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, against the United States for alleged loss and damages suffered by Robert A. Watson arising out of certain transactions between said Robert A. Watson and the Department of Justice of the United States, involving the purchase and importation of sugar from the Republic of Argentina in June 1920, and the alleged neglect, refusal, and failure of the Department of Justice to provide for the distribution thereof in accordance with the terms of a written agreement between claimant's decedent and said Department.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, and not otherwise to effect any substantive rights of the parties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased."

JOINT RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 153) for the authorization of a contribution

by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that this matter has been taken care of, it being the same as title IV of another bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The subject matter was included in ECA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey move that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4453) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard by the Senator from Florida. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 2113) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of Waymon H. Massey, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. On behalf of the senior Senator from Delaware, I object.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold my objection temporarily.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am very anxious to have this bill passed, because I think it has a great deal of merit. There are literally—I was going to say hundreds; and I think it is correct—but I know there are dozens and dozens of farmers in the United States who have purchased farms from the Government, on which the Government retained the mineral rights.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In order that we may save time, may I suggest that this bill go to the foot of the calendar until the Senator from Delaware is on the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have withheld my objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. If there is a possibility that continual objection is to be made to this bill, I should like, if possible, to get a vote on it this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator from Indiana that this is one of the bills which have been discussed by the Democratic Policy Committee. It is an extremely important measure, and it seems to me it ought to be passed on the Senate calendar.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that the Senator from Delaware undoubtedly has certain objections which he desires to address to the Senate. But there is more interest among farmers in this measure than in any other measure which has been before the Senate for some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. As I said a moment ago, this is an important measure from the standpoint of the farmers of the country, and the Secretary of Agriculture is very much interested in having the bill passed, in order that justice and equity may be done to the farmers, who should have these mineral rights.

I hope the Senator from Delaware will examine the report, or, if he has already done so, that he will reexamine it with a view to letting the bill pass this afternoon, without calling it up in regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do we correctly understand that the majority leader will call up this bill for a vote, if it is not handled on the consent calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. It is one of the bills that we expect to take up, I may say to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator very much. I am in favor of taking it up.

Mr. LUCAS. We have discussed it in the Democratic conference, and I am sure we can pass it without any trouble. I hope the Senator from Delaware will see fit to withdraw his objection to this bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Oklahoma has discussed this bill with the Senator from Delaware, and is of the

opinion that if it were passed to the foot of the calendar, it is entirely possible the objections could be waived and the bill permitted to pass. I notice the Senator from Delaware has returned to the floor, and I wonder whether he will state whether that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware wish to be recognized?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection, if it is desired to carry this bill to the foot of the calendar. However, it is only fair to say that I am almost certain it will not pass today. It has been about 6 weeks since I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the majority leader is a member. At that time I set forth certain questions which I wished to have answered before the bill was considered by the Senate. I received a letter from the committee saying that I would be given an opportunity of appearing before the committee. That has been 7 weeks ago. To this date I have not been extended that opportunity. Those questions, so far as the Senator from Delaware is concerned, are going to be answered before this bill is passed with my consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana withdraw his unanimous-consent request that the bill go to the foot of the calendar? That is the last request before the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I should like to make a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not against the bill. I wish it could be passed now by unanimous consent, after the explanation given of the bill by several Senators. I am not going to object to letting it go to the foot of the calendar. However, the Chair has called attention this afternoon to the slow progress we are making. If, by reason of objections by Senators, for reasons of their own, bills continue to go to the foot of the calendar, we shall never get through this afternoon. I shall not object, now, but I shall object to any other request to place bills at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not objecting to placing the bill at the foot of the calendar. I may say to the majority leader that if he wants this bill passed this afternoon, there is a possibility that that could be done, if he will call the department and ask them to reply to my letters of the last few weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired. Is there objection to this bill going to the foot of the calendar? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the next order of business on the calendar.

TRANSFER TO PIERCE COUNTY, WASH., OF SURPLUS LAND IN FORT LEWIS MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 5101) to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of cer-

tain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I objected to this bill when it was last before the Senate. I objected to it until I could have time to study it. I have since studied it and I find the situation to be that when this property was donated to the Federal Government for Army purposes it was with the express reservation that if the Federal Government ever ceased to use it for Army purposes in connection with the particular camp involved, it would automatically revert to the county. As a lawyer I then questioned the necessity for a bill. I think, Mr. President, that the reversionary clause itself entitles Pierce County to recover the property now that the Army no longer uses it for military purposes. Therefore, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5101) to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 8, after the word "taken", to strike out "by the State of Washington and Pierce County, Washington" and insert "in accordance with local law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On August 4, 1950:

S. 298. An act for the relief of John Rowland;

S. 648. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 705, to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations, and for other purposes;

S. 1491. An act for the relief of Rudolf Meinhard and Irene Hallinger;

S. 1760. An act to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734; 7 U. S. C. 429);

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Isabel Alba Casas, Concepcion Garcia Perez, Maria del Carmen Fernandez Matesaenz, Maria Santos Zuniga, Felipa Casado del Blanco, Mercedes Rodriguez Villanueva, Selina Milan Gonzalez, Teresa Duque Saenz, Martina Equiza Garces, and Teresa Baztan Elizalde;

S. 2183. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. Chicouras;

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Juliana Sosa de Solis;

S. 2608. An act for the relief of Dr. Kun Ken Hu;

S. 2866. An act for the relief of Egbert G. Gesell;

S. 2934. An act for the relief of Julius Elzas;

S. 3163. An act for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman;

S. 3253. An act for the relief of Lyon F. Hibberd and the estate of George T. Erb;

S. 3585. An act for the relief of Dodge County, Wis.;

S. 3553. An act to provide for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the return to Mexico of the flags, standards, colors, and emblems that were captured by the United States in the Mexican War.

On August 5, 1950:

S. 442. An act to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 533), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes;

S. 920. An act for the relief of Ellen Rodriguez Moreno;

S. 1059. An act for the relief of John W. Wagner;

S. 1419. An act for the relief of Wilhemus Johannes Marie Van Der Kooy;

S. 1551. An act for the relief of Jose Augusto Pereira;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Anastacia Roshani;

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Augusto Segre;

S. 2053. An act for the relief of Vivienne Joy Wilson and minor daughter Mary Ann Vaughn;

S. 2253. An act for the relief of Dr. In Sung Kwak;

S. 2723. An act for the relief of Maria del Carmen Moreno-Elorza, Maria Luisa Asin Luri, Rafaela Garcia Casini, Giovanni Importa, and Teresa Campagnoni;

S. 2990. An act for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier;

S. 2996. An act to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation;

S. 3098. An act to amend section 104 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville;

S. 3832. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the Ogden River Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; and

S. 3833. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the South Cache Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes.

On August 8, 1950:

S. 4. An act authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 679)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 12218-12220.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In trying to get a new start on the call of the calendar, the Chair is going to make a request of all those in the Chamber not to apply to Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, or those regularly employed on the floor of the Senate, but the other gentlemen in the Chamber can help the Senate greatly by finding places to sit down, and waiting

its criminal laws do not make innocent or everyday incidents criminal.

The difficulty arises fundamentally out of the attempt to change the whole basis of our criminal law, to introduce a wholly new theory of criminal law, that it is a crime to do an innocent act, provided that a jury can be persuaded by some prosecutor that the man who did that innocent act had some bad or even innocent state of mind inside his head.

There are other parts of the bill which seem to me to cover, in other ways, innocent people. But I think the examples I have given are sufficient to indicate the nature of the doubts that are troubling me.

Of course, if we pass laws under which everyone in the United States can be arrested and convicted, or half the people can be arrested and convicted, we may be able to send to prison everyone whom the detectives suspect of real wrongdoing, without being able to prove, by evidence, the actual wrongdoing. But this would mean the destruction of our democratic way of life. I am afraid that as one studies S. 595 more and more, it becomes clearer that it includes something of this blanket sort. A totalitarian system, with the real incompetence that goes with such a system, would have such a law; in a police state the great advantage the police enjoy is that they do not have to do the arduous work of getting the evidence of a real crime, they do not have to prove in court proceedings a real crime; they can send a man to prison for doing the most innocent things; and they get the judges to infer that the man they are after had an evil state of mind.

I cannot conclude this lengthy letter without expressing my personal appreciation for the arduous and self-sacrificing labors you have been performing as chairman. If the comments I have made can be of any service to you, I shall be greatly pleased. I think you are on a very fruitful line of inquiry in going into this bill further, and that the continuance of this process will be in the highest traditions of the committee, both before and during your chairmanship.

With kindest regards, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

H. M. KILGORE.

AUGUST 2, 1949.

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of July 26, 1949, concerning S. 595, a bill relating to the internal security of the United States. Needless to say, we are in agreement that no legislation should be supported which would appear in any way contrary to our fundamental concepts of democratic government.

In the light of your recent letter and previous correspondence about S. 595, the bill has again been reviewed by members of the staff of the Judiciary Committee and by me. I have not changed the conclusion which I reported to you in my last letter. I believe the bill as amended is satisfactory from both the practical and constitutional standpoints. Moreover, as you are aware, the bill in its present form has been given extremely careful consideration by both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, with the same conclusion.

Your letter of July 26, 1949, points out, as a specific example of your misgivings, subsection (a) of the first section. As you are doubtless aware, subsection (a) of the first section of the bill is merely a restatement of the existing law which has been a part of the Espionage Act of 1917 for many years. It was reiterated in this bill for the purpose of clarity to show how subsequent amendments, which the bill would enact, fit

in and relate to the entire Espionage Act of 1917.

Since this provision of the bill, concerning which you have expressed apprehension, has been the law for over 30 years, and there appears to have been no record of its abuse or successful attack on grounds of unconstitutionality, it is suggested that your fears with respect to this provision may be dispelled.

A study of the committee report on this bill will, I feel sure, help to clarify any remaining questions you may have with respect to the background, purpose, and practical application of the measure.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

MAY 20, 1950.

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
Majority Leader, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: One week from today—Saturday, May 27—will be the first anniversary of the day the bill S. 595, the so-called internal security bill, was reported favorably to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary.

During the year since the bill was reported, it has slumbered peacefully on the Senate calendar except for occasions when the calendar was called and the bill took the limelight, briefly—long enough to meet objection, usually from the minority side of the aisle.

At the time this bill was introduced, it was my understanding its enactment was desired by the administration. Can you tell me whether the administration still wants the bill passed, and if so, when it may be possible to call it up for consideration in the Senate?

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The next bill ordered put at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 660) to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be passed over.

The next bill ordered to the foot of the calendar will be stated.

DISPOSITION OF LANDS ON THE CABAZON, AUGUSTINE, AND TORRES-MARTINEZ INDIAN RESERVATIONS, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 4584) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations in California, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, what is the calendar number of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 920.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have on my calendar a note that consideration of the bill was previously objected to by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I understand that he is absent from the Senate Building at the moment, but will be back very soon.

So I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be placed at the foot of the calendar of this call, so that the Senator from North Dakota may have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I dislike to make objection to that request, but if we are to start to put at the foot of the calendar bills previously ordered to the foot of the calendar, I wonder how long that process will continue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a minute, please?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to have any of the rights of the Senator from North Dakota hurt; but the fact is that when this bill was reached during the call of the calendar yesterday, certain amendments were offered by the Senator from Kansas, and they were accepted. Then the Senator from North Dakota offered certain amendments, and they were accepted. The Senator from North Dakota then wanted to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar.

In my personal conversations with the Senator from North Dakota and with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Dakota indicated to me at that time that he would not object to the bill when it was reached at the foot of the calendar.

It seems to me that there is no further objections; and the Senator from North Dakota has preserved all his rights by indicating his intent to object to consideration of the bill only if there were further objection.

Therefore, Mr. President, inasmuch as the bill has been on the calendar since August 15, if there is no further objection, I should like to have the bill acted upon now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I withdraw objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4584), which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 6, in line 13, after the word "amount", to strike out "acquired" and insert "(not to exceed \$5,000) required."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill is passed over.

DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVED TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The bill (S. 3504) to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I asked my colleague if he would request that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar. I appreciate his doing so and I appreciate the Senate's acceding to the request.

I had asked that the bill be carried over until I could make some inquiries about it.

There are a great many persons who are interested in our aviation industry, but who regret that this bill does not go as far as it should. I share that opinion.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$12,500,000 over a period of 5 years for the operation, testing, and modification of aircraft. I believe that the need for the development of aviation—civil, as well as military—is so great that we should go much further than the bill proposes, and should provide Federal funds for the development, designing, and testing of advanced types of aircraft which will serve to advance the aviation industry in the United States.

I understand that today Great Britain is flying from the British Isles to the Continent planes which in some technological respects are several years ahead of the planes we have or the progress we have made in this field.

Furthermore, some of the independent operators and small operators feel that they are not likely to receive much benefit from this program, and that unless the Government is willing to build planes and give them a chance to use them or to test them, they will never get much benefit under this program.

I share their feeling that the bill should go further than it does.

However, the bill represents some progress; and I desire to commend and aid in, rather than to obstruct, that progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on yesterday I objected to the consideration of this bill. I did not think then, and I do not think now, that the bill goes as far as it should go. The bill may be a step in the right direction, and I think it is, but in my opinion this method of training and this method for the pro-

duction of aircraft should be enhanced, and more progress should be made.

I am not going to object now to the present consideration of the bill; I am withdrawing my objection. I hope the bill will be enacted, because I think it is a beginning of a program which should be pushed forward with celerity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3504), which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote, in the interest of safety, the national air-transportation system and the national defense, the development of improved transport aircraft, particularly turbine-powered aircraft, aircraft especially adapted to the economical transportation of cargo, and aircraft suitable for feeder-line operation, by providing for temporary Government assistance in the testing and minor experimental modification of such aircraft, and in the operation of available turbine-powered aircraft in simulated transport service to secure data to aid in the development and manufacture of turbine-powered transport aircraft, and to aid in the adaptation of civil airways, civil airports, and air-safety regulations applicable to civil aircraft to the operation of such aircraft.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to carry out the purposes of this act by—

(1) preparing broad operating and general utility characteristics and specifications for all types of such aircraft which he finds are required in the public interest, and which represent potential advances over existing aircraft;

(2) providing for the operation, by contract or otherwise, of available aircraft with turbine-jet or turbine-prop power units under conditions simulating, to the extent practicable, the conditions under which scheduled air transport aircraft operate;

(3) providing, by contract or otherwise, for the testing of such aircraft which, in his opinion, best meet the operating and utility characteristics and specifications established by him in accordance with this section; and

(4) providing for such minor experimental modifications of such aircraft during the testing period which he believes necessary to carry out the testing program in the interests of safety or economy of operation.

(b) In carrying out his functions under this section, the Secretary shall consult, from time to time, with interested Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and with representatives of the respective segments of the aviation manufacturing industries and of the air transport industry.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to any provision of law limiting the number of personnel which may be employed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be deemed necessary to assist the Secretary in carrying out his functions under this act: *Provided*, That to the extent practicable consistent with other duties and assignments, the personnel and facilities of existing Government agencies shall be used to carry out the responsibilities stated in this act.

(b) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 2 of this act, may enter

into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with or without legal considerations, performance or other bonds, or competitive bidding, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(a) The term "aircraft" shall include engines, airframes, propellers, rotors, instruments, accessories, and equipment for such aircraft.

(b) The term "testing" means the operation of an aircraft incident to the procurement of a type certificate for such aircraft, and the operation of an aircraft, whether type certificated or not, in actual or simulated transport service for the purpose of determining the operating and utility characteristics of such aircraft.

(c) The term "minor experimental modifications" means any adjustment or change necessary and incident to carrying out the testing program in the interest of safety or economy of operation but does not include any major factory modification.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit annually to the Congress a report on the progress made in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, and the amounts of the expenditures made or obligated pursuant thereto, together with such recommendations as to additional legislation relating thereto as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce not to exceed \$12,500,000 to carry out the purposes of this act. When so provided in the appropriation act concerned, such appropriations may remain available until expended.

SEC. 7. This act shall become effective upon enactment, and shall expire 5 years thereafter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7722) to provide for the acquisition and preservation as a part of the National Capital Parks System, of the Old Stone House in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the announcement I now make does not pertain to the bill which has just been reached; but I wish to make this statement for the Record:

At the last call of the calendar, by request I had objection interposed, through the acting majority leader, at a time when I was not present, to the consideration of Calendar 2044, Senate Resolution 291, a resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson] for himself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'Mahoney], calling for an investigation of gasoline prices in the United States. I wish the Record to show that I made the objection by request.

I have not interposed such objection at this call of the calendar, and I shall not interpose objection in the future.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7722?

of the calendar, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I am constrained to object, by request, to the consideration of this measure.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment, in order that I may explain why enactment of this proposed legislation is so important to the entire Northwest, I shall appreciate it very much.

Yesterday I received telephone calls from the Northwest, namely, from Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana—informing me that they are so short of grain cars that they simply cannot move the grain, and much grain is in danger of spoiling because it is simply dumped on the ground. We have had such a shortage of grain cars every year for the past 7 or 8 years, to my personal knowledge.

The information I have from the Interstate Commerce Commission is that we are short 20,000 box cars and flat cars, and that we shall continue to be short of such cars for years to come.

One reason why we need to have this bill enacted, so as to provide package-freight shipping facilities on the Great Lakes, is to relieve the railroads of a great amount of freight which the water transportation could well carry.

It seems wrong to me that this bill should be objected to, and that it should have been objected to on the numerous calls we have had of the calendar. All we are asking is that the Middle West be treated in the same manner as the Atlantic seaboard was treated when Liberty ships were bought. We are asking only that the operators on the Great Lakes be permitted to buy these ships, which were surplus assets at the end of the late war, in the same manner that those on the Atlantic seaboard bought them during the past year.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Still reserving the right to object—and I shall, of course, object—I merely want to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am quite sure he understands the capacity in which the Senator from Kansas is making this objection on behalf of the minority committee on the calendar. It is not my objection, but an objection lodged with us by a Senator. I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over. That concludes the call of the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1140. An act to authorize credits to certain public agencies in the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico;

S. 2491. An act providing for the conveying of land and buildings at Fort Phillip Kearney Military Reservation to the State of Rhode Island;

S. 2868. An act to incorporate the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; S. 3698. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work;

H. R. 2854. An act for the relief of the estate of Wade H. Noland; and

S. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into a compact or agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1140. An act to authorize credits to certain public agencies in the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico;

S. 2491. An act providing for the conveying of land and buildings at Fort Phillip Kearney Military Reservation to the State of Rhode Island;

S. 2868. An act to incorporate the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; S. 3698. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis certain inspection services involving overtime work; and

S. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into a compact or agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon the distinguished majority leader gave notice that calendar No. 1333, the bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, would be taken up following the call of the calendar. At the time of his announcement the distinguished majority leader was not aware of a tacit understanding which we had yesterday in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that this bill would not be called up until we had hearings on certain matters pertaining to the sale of mineral rights made by the Department of Agriculture under lands other than those involved in H. R. 4800.

I wish to advise the Senate that tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will proceed to hear representatives of the Department of Agriculture who are familiar with the sale of certain mineral rights heretofore made by the Department of Agriculture and which were brought to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware does not object to the bill, but that he is anxious to obtain certain information from the Department of Agricul-

ture in regard to the sale of mineral rights previously made on lands not involved in H. R. 4800. It is hoped that, after tomorrow, we may be able to clear the issues raised by the Senator from Delaware and probably get the bill up for consideration without much further delay. That is my hope.

Mr. LUCAS. That is satisfactory.

PICKETING UNITED STATES COURTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 968, the bill (H. R. 5647) to prohibit the picketing of United States courts. This bill has been on the calendar for over a year and I have given notice on several occasions that I would call up the bill for action at the first opportunity. Should my motion prevail I propose to strike from the bill all the language after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the language of S. 1681, a Senate bill on the same subject and now on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this bill has been on the calendar for some time. It is a bill which deals with the internal security of the country. It seems to me in view of the fact that the majority leader earlier this afternoon made an announcement as to what the program would be, upon which all Senators have relied, that it is now completely out of order, at this late hour, to move to take up a bill of this kind. A quorum call would be necessary. It seems to me that if the Senator from Louisiana will but restrain himself until we take up the internal security bill, following the disposition of the tax bill, he will have plenty of time to offer this bill as an amendment. That is where it belongs, since it involves the internal security of the country. There is no doubt that he has the votes.

There are a number of similar bills. Most of them have been more or less merged into the McCarran anti-Communist bill. I anticipate that the Senator from Louisiana probably will have no trouble in having the bill adopted as an amendment. But it seems to me that to move the consideration of the bill this afternoon at 3 o'clock, necessitating as it would a quorum call, when we have agreed to take up the tax bill tomorrow, is not the thing to do. I certainly hope the motion will not be agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the presentation made by the able majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, does not seem to me to fit the situation at this time. The provision to prohibit the picketing of United States courts is not in the anti-Communist bill, which will come up immediately following the tax bill. It was formerly a part of it, but it was stricken from the bill by the committee.

Mr. President, this bill rose out of a situation which must of necessity have aroused the people of America. In the midst of a solemn trial, when men's lives were at stake and when the dignity of the Government was at stake, as well, the court, in which there should have been decorum, regular order, and decent proceedings, was disturbed and annoyed by a picketing of the court. It seems to

me that that is carrying picketing to a point where the American people will not tolerate it any longer. If there is any one thing in the world the American people look to for the preservation of our form of government it is the courts and the court procedures. If certain groups are to be permitted to disturb the orderly proceedings, of courts, then it seems to me we have reached a point where dignity in court procedure, not only as it may affect the Government, but also as it may affect the individual on trial, is a thing of the past. It seems to me it has been carried too far.

The right of juries to consider facts presented in a court under orderly rules of procedure seems to me to be a thing which far transcends the right to picket. All that this bill is designed to do is to protect the courts of the country from disorderly conduct within the courts and about and around the courts, during the course of trials.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the motion of the Senator from Louisiana prevails, I shall invite any Senator who is interested in any bill which is on the calendar to move to take it up, following this bill. It was not agreed that this bill should be considered. There was no reference to it this afternoon when we were discussing the order of business. It is not at all a question of the merit or demerit of this bill. What the Senator from Nevada says has absolutely nothing to do with the question of procedure in the Senate. Are we to follow a certain line of procedure as laid down by the Policy Committee, or, after a program has been laid down, with no dissenting voice heard in connection with it, and when many Senators have left the Chamber, and have been told that when the call of the calendar was concluded there would be no other business transacted, unless it should be some bill on which everyone agreed, are Senators to be permitted to move the consideration of a bill which has not been included in the program?

Certainly this is a measure which affects the internal security of the country. The fact that the Senator from Nevada has said it was originally in his bill is a definite indication that he thought it to be a matter affecting the internal security, otherwise he would not have included it in the over-all provisions of the McCarran anti-Communist bill.

For some reason, it was stricken out in the committee; for what reason, I do not know. Certainly this measure can be tacked onto the anti-Communist bill next week, and no doubt it will be; but to take it up at this late hour in the afternoon, at a time when the Senator from Georgia was on his feet and ready to move the consideration of the tax bill, as it was understood by all Senators would be done, seems to me to be not in keeping with the best practices in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I say that in the best of faith. It is not a question of whether we are for the bill or against it; it is a question of orderly procedure in the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the Senate was to proceed to the consideration of the mineral bill this afternoon?

Mr. LUCAS. I made that announcement. It was agreed that after a quorum call that bill would be taken up. The able Senator from Louisiana came to me and stated that there would be a hearing tomorrow, as the result of a protest made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I then said that we would not take up the mineral bill, after I had promised a dozen Senators that it would be taken up. In view of the fact that the Senator from Louisiana came to me and said, "We are holding a hearing tomorrow, and after the hearing there will be no protest." I said, "Fine. We shall not call up the mineral bill, because if a hearing is to be held and Senator WILLIAMS desires to be heard and there will probably be some sort of an agreement, obviously I am not going to interfere with that sort of an arrangement." That is the reason we are not going to call up the mineral bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood that the tax bill will be called tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be made the unfinished business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will it be debated this afternoon?

Mr. LUCAS. That I do not know.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, it will merely be made the unfinished business, and I presume that the Senate will then take a recess until tomorrow. It is now 3 o'clock and why not take up the picketing bill today?

Mr. LUCAS. If any Senator has a bill which he wants to have considered as a result of what the Senator from Louisiana is trying to do, I invite all Senators who have bills, following the disposition of this bill, to proceed to call them up. After I have told Senators that there would be no further business this afternoon, after the call of the calendar, and many Senators have left the Chamber, we may as well make it an open session for everyone.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I informed the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that, so far as any objection on this side of the aisle was concerned, there would be none if he asked unanimous consent to take up the so-called mineral bill. I want the RECORD to show that. I am not interested in what is going to happen tomorrow or the next day in any hearing. I want the majority leader to know that so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, there will be no objection made to taking up the mineral bill if he wants to call it up this afternoon. I think it will be passed if it is brought up.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to have that information from the minority leader, because the only reason why I told the Senator from Louisiana that we would

not take up House bill 4800 was because of the plea he made to me because of the Senator from Delaware who desired to be heard before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry tomorrow. Now the Senator from Nebraska tells me that there is no objection on the part of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as that bill is concerned, if the majority leader asks unanimous consent to take it up, I am sure there will be no objection made on this side of the aisle.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the Senator from Delaware has withdrawn his objection to the immediate consideration of the so-called mineral bill?

Mr. WHERRY. I said that if the majority leader asked unanimous consent to take up the mineral bill, whether the Senator from Delaware is on the floor or not, I am quite satisfied there will be no objection made.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. LUCAS. Under those circumstances I shall certainly try to have House bill 4800 taken up. I only attempted to postpone action in view of what the Senator from Louisiana said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4800 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that for many months there has been before the Senate a very important measure having to do with our national defense. I refer to Senate bill 3727 to authorize certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base, and for other purposes. On many occasions I have consulted the distinguished majority leader in an effort to have the bill considered by the Senate. I feel constrained to object, Mr. President, until such time as we have had an opportunity to act on Senate bill 3727.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that Senate bill 3727 is definitely a defense measure and highly recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, by the chairman of the committee, and by the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as by the Military Establishment?

Mr. HUNT. Action upon it has been requested by the Military Establishment. They have urged consideration of the bill on several occasions, over the telephone.

I shall have to object to the consideration of the mineral bill until consideration is given to Senate bill 3727.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consider-

ation of House bill 4800 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that there is another motion pending.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Martin
Benton	Holland	Maybank
Bricker	Humphrey	Millikin
Bridges	Hunt	Morse
Butler	Ives	Mundt
Byrd	Jenner	Murray
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworschak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Leahy	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taylor
Flanders	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
George	McCarran	Thye
Gillette	McCarthy	Tydings
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	McMahon	Williams
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Malone	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED LOAN TO SPAIN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the weeks since the Senate approved a loan to Spain there has been a good deal of objection from men who claim that we have disappointed many European allies.

It is stated, and the statement is terribly true, that the United States is now at the crossroads; that we are trying to persuade some vacillating countries in Europe and Asia to line up with America in combating communism. It is stated, and with great truth, that our democracy must win the political allegiance of Greeks and Chinese, French and Malaysians, and those Russian satellites which, eventually, may break away from Russia, and join the system of western nations. It is stated that to achieve these results, the western nations must adhere to certain standards of conduct; must not condone authoritarian methods; and must set the world standard for democracy in action. And here, again, I agree.

But the opponents claim that, in giving financial help to the Spanish Government, the United States is departing from these standards; that we will appear to other nations as political opportunists, willing to team up with Spain for the sake of questionable military help. That seems to be the objectors' case.

Mr. President, I do not propose to ridicule this argument or question its motive. It is well motivated.

I simply say that the argument is woefully incomplete. And, to be quite

blunt, I don't believe that it is very objective. I think it shows too much concern for those segments of European and Asiatic populations that are already sold on communism. I believe it underestimates the reasoning capacity of millions who are in dead center, politically. It is an argument that shows undue preoccupation with the reaction of the avowed extreme leftists of the world, who are lost to us anyway. I think this can be demonstrated.

I certainly do not propose to give the Spanish regime a clean bill of health, because that, too, would be a departure from objectivity. But I wish now to submit a proposition which may straighten our thinking, or, to put it better, will force us to review some of the ironies of recent history.

The Spanish regime today operates under rigid controls. It practices a degree of suppression of personal liberties and private actions which we in America would not accept. We would not accept such controls in America, and we do not lend our approval when they occur elsewhere. But let us see what happens, on close examination of the principle, when it is applied to Spain. What happens is that we hold on to the principle, and recognize a dilemma.

Spain today is authoritarian as a consequence of events. In the thirties Spain went through one of the bloodiest civil wars in history. The parties to that war were two blocs of Spanish people, each of which accepted military assistance from outside nations.

On one side, which we can designate as the left, there was an assortment of ideologies. In the left there was a huge bloc of out-and-out Communists, whose only allegiance was to Russia. In the left there were also five or six more groups that ranged, in their political beliefs, from Tito-brand communism to pale-pink idealists. There were groups who opposed the monarchy and some who remembered old regency scores and economic abuses. But when the war became bloody the members of this amalgam soon lost their individual identities. Russia jumped in with enormous contributions of military help, and with this intervention the cause became, to all intents and purposes, the cause of Russian Communists. Had the left won the war, it is beyond argument that the emerging government would have been straight Communist.

On the other side, which we can designate as the right, there was a similar amalgam of groups. There was a huge bloc of Spaniards who simply hated communism, but had miscellaneous political faiths. There were groups ranging the political spectrum all the way from simple anticommunism to the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini. The coalition also accepted outside help, offered by the Fascist states, so that its members lost identity, and the cause thereby became identified with that of fascism.

The war was not a pretty war, and the two contesting doctrines, one in each bloc, were, to Americans, both odious.

The war was a long one and as bloody as only civil wars can be. It was won by the group on the right. But winning the war did not settle the political controversy, the political differences which had caused the war. The defeated Communists were certainly not converted to democracy any more than they were converted to the political methods of the winner. They were merely defeated in a war.

This created a situation of fact. The land called Spain at the end of the war now consisted of a population bloc which had won a war, and a population bloc which had lost a war.

I suppose it could be argued that a democracy could have been set up in this political chaos, after this political fratricide that had filled so many cemeteries. But my own belief is that in the Spain of those circumstances there would not have been peace, there would not have been democracy, there would not have been the self-restraint which we associate with democratic-minded people—and I doubt that there would have been any willingness on the part of the defeated Communists to live in orderly harmony in a democratic regime voted by a majority.

I say this, I believe, with some basis. I say it because men who adhere to communism, men who take out the Communist Party card, do not believe in the orderly process of rule by the majority. To them this is ridiculous, old-fashioned Hamiltonian and Jeffersonian stupidity. The Communists believe that when you have 2 percent of the population you should try for 10 percent, and on the day that you have 10 percent the time is ripe for a coup d'état—or a revolution—or the lowering of the drawbridge to let outside Communist armies pour in and take over. I have named three different techniques; and if Senators take a glance at recent developments in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and a land called China, I believe they will find that in each case one of those three techniques delivered those countries to Russia—to that club now referred to as the iron curtain.

In Spain, the bloc which won the war was faced with a population mass, estimated at 10 to 20 percent of the total population of the country, and which, embittered even more by the war, now acknowledged only one sovereignty—that of Russia.

I do not know what any Member of this body would have done had he found himself in the hypothetical position of governor-general of Spain in those circumstances.

The Spanish Government solved it in a way which is distasteful to us in America. That is, Spain became a garrison state, in what was determined as a necessity to suppress the latent rebellion of that bloc of the Spanish population which still wanted communism.

I reiterate that I do not condone a police state, and I believe that I understand something of the precepts of Hamilton and Jefferson. I do not condone a police state. I do not want it in this country and will fight any development of any trace of it. But this belief in our

own principles raises an interesting situation when we evaluate other countries. Switching our gaze to the land called Spain, and assuming that we have an equal dislike for a Communist Spain, I do not know what solution would have worked. Had Spain set up a democracy, with elections and a free press, I do not think it would have remained a democracy more than 6 months, or perhaps 6 weeks. I believe Spain would simply have become another Czechoslovakia—or, if you will, another Yugoslavia—or, if you think the analogy not exact, then another Rumania, or Bulgaria.

In each of those countries small groups of men of good faith tried desperately, shortly after 1945, to set up democracies. In each of those countries there were men of high principle, men opposed to compromise, men who understood what Jefferson meant—who fought the good fight to set up governments wherein a majority chooses those who govern, and the minority abides by the decision. But what happened to them? They were outmatched and outmaneuvered by Communist minorities, groups of Communists who stacked the deck for the dealer in Moscow. I do not believe that there was ever, at any moment, a true Communist majority in Hungary, in Bulgaria, in Czechoslovakia, in Rumania, in Yugoslavia, or in China. Those countries succumbed to their Communist minorities, working in concert with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In Spain the Government met an identical situation by setting up rigid authoritarian controls, and it has carried on, with unnatural rigidities and certain undemocratic methods, from that day to this. And there you have it—action and reaction. A minority, ready day and night to sell out to Russia—held in check by a Government whose methods we Americans reject. That was the status of things in Spain after the nation had buried its dead.

In 1945, that is to say, the year when the Allies destroyed the Axis, the victorious nations started the process of organizing world peace, presumably eternal peace. They formed the United Nations, and they excluded from the new club all those countries which, theoretically, were not ready for democracy. I say theoretically, because one of the members in that democratic club was Russia, a country which leans, I believe, a little closer to Marx than to Jefferson. This club barred Germany, Italy, and Japan because they did not have the requisite belief in democracy which was a condition for membership. But we waived the requirement for Russia because Russia had been a part of the alliance that fought the Axis. Spain was barred because its war record and political institutions were not acceptable to the Allies.

For the subsequent 5 years, Spain has been excluded from all international clubs.

Three years ago it became evident that club member Russia was out to communize the world. After this club member had conquered 10 countries of Europe we organized another club—called the Atlantic Pact—to save what

was left in Europe. Spain was again excluded, for the original reason that it did not operate by democratic methods.

We come now, I believe, to the crux of the matter.

During the years 1949 and 1950 it became apparent that the western nations must prepare for war with Russia. Regardless of whether or not there will be a war with Russia, we must now prepare for a war with Russia. As stated by our Secretary of State, we must confront Russia with a situation of strength.

In building this so-called situation of strength we set up an operation called the Marshall plan. That is a \$15,000,000,000 expenditure to bolster up the economic strength of the European countries who might thereby stifle the growth of local communism. In building up the situation of strength, we voted a \$200,000,000 Greek-Turkish military-aid program to assist those two countries to develop resistance to communism, both economic and military. In creating the situation of strength we signed a mutual defense treaty with 12 nations of Europe, the so-called Atlantic Pact; and we are considering the expenditure of \$5,000,000,000 to finance that operation. We have also agreed to make it a war in Korea—with men and guns—to confront Russia with a situation of strength; and we are swinging into a program of domestic rearmament for which we expect to spend \$23,000,000,000 this year.

We have also embarked on a program of political education in many countries, aimed at convincing people what America's objectives are, and why we think they should choose democracy instead of communism. If we succeed in explaining our story we shall have achieved a real situation of strength.

In the light of the policy of situation of strength, I should now like to discuss our policy on Spain.

The United States Senate recently voted a \$100,000,000 loan to Spain as another contribution to this thing called situation of strength. The opponents of the loan have claimed that it does not build up our situation of strength, but that it has the opposite effect of making us look like compromisers, in the eyes of the world; that it will alienate people whom we would like to have on our side.

This argument, which has appeared in a number of editorials in the weeks since the Senate voted the loan, is what I propose to examine today.

From the military standpoint, of course, many men in the Pentagon agree that having Spain on our side is a military asset. But, Mr. President, I do not propose to base my argument on the military advantages to be gained by having Spain within our military alliance. I propose to argue this matter squarely on the basis of the issues raised by the opponents of the loan, namely, that in extending a loan to Spain we have hurt ourselves on many propaganda frontiers, that we have alienated peoples who might otherwise be more eager to side with us in a war with Russia, that we have committed a propaganda blunder, that, in short, we have compromised our principles and have tried to buy the al-

legiance of Spain with a paltry hundred million dollars.

You will note, Mr. President, that I have tried to capture the letter and the spirit of the opponents' argument on the loan to Spain.

I believe that the proposition should be placed on the following platform:

What are we doing when we lend Spain some American dollars? Are we sharing that guilt by association which is such a shibboleth in the State Department? We have just fought a war against Fascists, and we have very few Fascists in America today, so I doubt that anyone can seriously charge that the United States favors fascism, and do so with a straight face. Russia will make the charge, surely, but Russia is making the charge already, and will continue to hurl it, regardless of what we do, because to the orthodox Communist mind, any nation which resists Russian domination is Fascist.

What we have done, really, is to encourage the first step, among the many, many necessary steps, before Spain can join the western system with democratic institutions, and can evolve into something closer to a democratic country than is possible for her today. For when the democratic member states within the United Nations slammed the door on Spain, they blocked the physical possibility of relaxing Spain's regimentation. When Spain was adjudged the pariah among nations, that embittered still more the leftists of Spain. In effect, it maddened them more, and solidified their belief that Russian liberation is their only hope. Conversely, it solidified the fears of those in authority that a Communist explosion was a permanent threat. The original dilemma that forced the Spanish Government to meet force with force was not helped when the rest of the western nations quarantined Spain. The quarantine did nothing to relieve the inner tensions.

I have reason to believe that the Spanish Government does not relish all the controls it has deemed necessary to impose in order to hold these inner tensions in check, and that it would relax them if it thought that an internal Communist coup would not result. I believe that if Spain is given to understand that other nations appreciate her dilemma, even though they are not enthusiastic about her methods of dealing with it, Spain will move progressively in the direction of the west. I believe that, over a period of years, all but the unreconstructed card-carrying Communists of Spain will abandon their fierce allegiance to Russia, if it is demonstrated to them that Spain is entering on a process of joining the west; and by joining the west I mean a progressive adoption of western political institutions.

But I believe that Spain needs help in this process, because the current political dilemma, the suppressed strength of Spain's Communists, is a pressure that must somehow be diverted.

In support of the proposition that it can be diverted we do not have to look far for an analogy. Italy, in 1947, faced a situation where exactly one-third of the population had accepted commu-

nism. The timely intervention of America with economic help, with an offer of friendship with a guaranty of military aid, and with a long and tireless program of explanation of the benefits of democracy—that form of intervention eased the Communist pressure enormously. It is estimated today that the Communist pressure in Italy now comes from only a sixth of the population, instead of a third. This is not a complete solution of the Communist danger in Italy, but it is, certainly, almost miraculous to have achieved such a reduction of the Communist threat in less than 3 years.

Mr. President, I urge the policy of riding ourselves of some of our fetishes; that we permit another nation, whose majority hates communism as much as we do, to work into the family of western nations. I believe that a great many of the political situations in Spain, which we do not find palatable, will be ameliorated if we help start the process. But if Spain is to remain behind the barricades and continue to be subject to this world quarantine, Spain cannot ease these pressures. If Spain is to start on this long road, I think she will need outside help. I do not think that a nation currently forced to rely on strong-arm methods can ever change those methods, if the government in authority finds itself an outcast, politically at war with the Soviet world, and politically shunned by the democratic world. I believe the world quarantine simply perpetuates the internal rift.

There is another point to make in erecting the proposition of the status of Spain. It is said that our proposed loan to what is currently an authoritarian state has supplied propaganda for the radio mills in Moscow—and to the radio mills of the 11 satellite states of Europe—and to some more radio mills in what is now Communist China—and to some other mills, in 20 more countries, that get their script from Moscow.

Those same radio mills have been saying for weeks that the United States attacked North Korea. Those mills have been saying for 5 years that America wants war. How many examples must one cite, to catch the enormity of Russia's bad faith? I believe that if the Communist radio mills could not make a recording out of our help to Spain, they would not necessarily run out of material. It would be no effort for them to substitute a recording saying that the Boy Scouts of America achieve the eagle badge by shooting their mothers. I believe, Mr. President, that the addition of another cap-pistol report to the artillery of Communist propaganda will not make any more Communist converts, whereas, the entry of a whole nation into the western family of Nations might, I think, have some propaganda merit of its own.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator who was in charge of that investigation whether it would appear to him that, if the Spanish Government were to fall—and I am speaking of the present Spanish Government—the likelihood would be that that government would be succeeded by a democratic government, or whether he would think it more likely that it would be succeeded by a Communist government.

Mr. McCARRAN. In my judgment, it would be succeeded by a Communist government, because of the Communist minority, that has been demonstrated by the fact that in other countries the same kind of minority has set up a government, and those who attempted to set up democracies have failed.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know of any substantial movement afoot by actual democratic elements within Spain to overthrow the present government and to set up one that would be regarded as truly democratic?

Mr. McCARRAN. The true democrats in Spain do not want to overthrow the present government at this time, because the isolated position into which we have put Spain gives the Communist minority of Spain an upper hand, which will enable it to overcome the democratic majority. So that government, which has at least held the situation in equipoise, is now favored for the time being, until the western countries recognize Spain as a competent and capable power eligible to come into their sisterhood.

And now, Mr. President, my last point. There has been some quarrel as to the manner in which this loan shall be made. There have been objections to making it through the instrumentality of the Marshall plan. There have been some suggestion that this loan be made, in a manner of speaking, under the table, furtively like a side transaction from one of our private banks. Instead, I believe that it should be made, deliberately, within the structure of the Marshall plan, and that it should be administered within the philosophy of the Marshall plan. For, Mr. President, we need make no apologies for the Marshall plan. The philosophy of the Marshall plan is that private enterprise is not exactly done for. It is a recognition that here and there, and specifically in 16 different countries, some pump priming is necessary to restore belief in private enterprise. I realize, of course, that a hundred million dollars is not an amount that will solve all the problems of any nation's economy, nor am I advocating any more than that amount. What I do advocate, emphatically, is that this loan be declared to be within the spirit of the Marshall plan. That is, to restore belief in the working of western methods. I do not believe that a hundred million dollars will set the Spanish economy on its feet, nor do I think that a hundred-million-dollar loan will change certain Spanish political institutions overnight.

But I believe our willingness to make the loan carries a message that the league of western nations is open to membership whenever Spain's political

institutions qualify. I believe that, as in Italy and as in France, some of the pressures will ease, and that the loan will thus help in the solution of the Spanish dilemma.

Mr. President, the substance of my message this afternoon has been a single point; that we start that process, long as it might be, which will enable Spain to solve its dilemma, and achieve those qualifications which will enable it to be accepted in the western family of nations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not wish to object—if any motions are to be made—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not present this afternoon when the distinguished Senator from Illinois announced a tentative program for today. I was under the impression that, since we did not intend to consider the so-called mineral bill, the tax bill would be made the unfinished business, and that we would recess at 3 o'clock. Therefore, I moved the consideration of House bill 5647—the antipicketing bill. I do not care to embarrass my good friend the distinguished Senator from Illinois. He has assured me that the court-picketing bill will be called up some time next week, either by way of amendment to the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill or independently. With that understanding, I withdraw my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana withdraws his motion.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make a statement in reply to the Senator from Louisiana, and I wish to express my appreciation for the position which he has taken. Yesterday I announced a program, and the Senator's bill was not included. Therefore I had announced that following consideration of the tax bill the Senate would take up every phase of the internal security question as represented by measures on the calendar at the present time. There is no reason why the Senator from Louisiana cannot offer his bill as an amendment to the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill and get a vote on it next week, when we shall be discussing the entire subject of internal security. The reason why I objected to taking up the bill at this time was be-

cause a number of Senators were told that when we had finished the call of the calendar we would take up the mineral bill, and then recess.

Later on the able Senator from Louisiana informed me that the committee would hold hearings on the mineral bill, and I agreed with him not to take it up. However, after colloquy with the able Senator from Nebraska, the majority leader, we agreed to take up the mineral bill because he would assume the responsibility for taking up the measure at this time.

I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the opposition from the other side of the aisle to taking up House bill 4800 has been withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. I made the statement on the floor that so far as the minority leader was concerned I was sure that if a unanimous-consent agreement was proposed to consider House bill 4800 there would be no objection. While I am on my feet I should like to state that there was no objection on the part of the minority leader to considering the antipicketing bill, but I wanted the majority leader to know and I wanted the RECORD to show my position because of statement he had made this morning, in answer to a query of mine, that without objection the mineral bill would be taken up immediately after the call of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. The minority leader says there is no objection on his part to taking up the anti-picketing bill. That may be true, but the Senator from Nebraska knows that bill was not covered in any statement I had made heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not infer that at all. What I want the RECORD to show is that, so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, I am not attempting to crowd out the anti-picketing bill in order to take up the mineral bill. I believe the majority leader, in answer to an inquiry by the junior Senator from Nebraska, is perfectly right in insisting upon the mineral bill being taken up, because he stated that following the call of the calendar, if we proceeded with any business, it would be with the consideration of the mineral bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I wish to repeat what I said some time ago. We must have a certain amount of orderly procedure in the Senate. There cannot be any question about it. After a program is announced, and after a quorum call has been had, it seems to me that if Senators are to be permitted to move the consideration of any bill they may desire to have considered we shall have chaos and confusion. That is why I issued an open invitation to any Senator to take up any bill, in the event the antipicketing bill should be taken up, and that we would proceed to the consideration of any other bill regardless of whether Senators were present. That is the danger, Mr. President, once the bars are let down.

That is all I have to say, on that point. It is solely a question of procedure that I was discussing, and not the merits or demerits of any bill. Perhaps there will

be no question about the antipicketing bill, when it comes up. I wanted to make my position absolutely clear, and I am sure that other Members of the Senate will agree with me.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Bill 4800, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes. It is calendar No. 1333.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. This is the bill which I had scheduled to take up this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention that if consideration of the bill is not concluded today that the Senate proceed with consideration of the tax bill tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 2, line 25, after the word "therefor", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That, in the event any mineral interests covered by this act are not sold as provided herein pursuant to application filed within 7 years from the effective date of this act or within 7 years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests of the United States, whichever date is later, the Secretary shall forthwith transfer title to such mineral interests, with the exception of those which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, to the Secretary of the Interior to be administered under the mineral laws of the United States."

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would tell us what the effect of the amendment would be, as well as give us a short explanation of the purpose of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the amendment is simply to make sure that a landowner must obtain a transfer of mineral rights under his land within 7 years otherwise the mineral rights would remain in the Government, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WHERRY. I glanced through the report rather hurriedly—and one must do that in order to keep up with legislation—and it seems to me—

Mr. ELLENDER. I have a prepared statement before me which I should like to read to the Senate. It is very short, and explains the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, H. R.

4800 establishes a nationally sound, equitable, and uniform policy for transferring Government-reserved mineral rights to the present landowners. This transfer would be made to the land owners. I desire to point out to Senators that the measure relates only to mineral rights retained by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the disposal of farm lands acquired pursuant to agricultural improvement and agricultural credit programs. Lands purchased until title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act and permanently retired from production, and lands acquired pursuant to the laws permitting the liquidation of wartime labor camps, are specifically excluded.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct to say that lands in the public domain which have never been disposed of are not included in this bill; likewise, mineral reserves which were reserved at the time of the sale from the public domain are not included?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. In further answer to the distinguished Senator, it covers primarily lands acquired by the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration which are now being administered by the Farmers Home Administration. The entire acreage involved in the bill is about 1,100,000 acres.

This legislation has been prompted by the following history: Prior to 1946, certain agricultural lands were acquired by two Government agencies, the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration; these lands were acquired for resale to farmers. They were sold with all or a major part of the minerals reserved to the Government. Also during this period a Government-owned corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed the same policy in disposing of agricultural lands which it had acquired in the course of its farm-lending operations.

It will be recalled by Senators, I am sure, that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was the banking institution handling land bank commissions' loans that were made during the depression. Quite a large acreage of land was acquired through foreclosure by that organization during its operations.

However, with the enactment of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, the policy was changed by the Congress with respect to the disposal by the Agriculture Department of farm lands of the type I have mentioned. In this latter connection, Mr. President, section 9 of the 1946 Farmers Home Administration Act provides that, "Any conveyance of real estate by the Government or any Government agency under this chapter shall include the mineral rights." That is the policy we are now trying to follow by the enactment of the pending bill, to make the whole procedure uniform.

Thus the Farmers Home Administration, successor to the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration, now follows the policy of

divesting the Government's ownership in the minerals as well as the surface rights whenever farm lands acquired under certain agricultural programs are resold to farmers. Recently the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, in disposing of mineral interests reserved by it in the course of its farm-finance operations, has been following essentially the same policy as is incorporated in the bill now before us.

The pending legislation, Mr. President, seeks only to grant relief to those farmers who, under the agricultural programs I have just mentioned, purchased lands prior to 1946 from the Department of Agriculture and from the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. H. R. 4800 will enable these farmers to obtain ownership of all minerals under their lands, and thereby will put them in the same status as farmers who acquired lands after passage of the 1946 act. This bill does not give the mineral rights to the present landowners; it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell these rights to the landowners, upon receipt of their written applications. In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is no active mineral development or leasing, the bill establishes a nominal sale price of \$1 per application; in areas where there is active mineral development and leasing, the mineral interests shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate. The bill further provides that in determining whether or not there is active mineral development in an area, the Secretary shall consult with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities.

In this measure, Mr. President, the burden is placed on the present landowner to make application to the Secretary of Agriculture for conveyance of the mineral interest. Only private persons who, at the time of the application, are owners of the surface of the land may apply, and the landowner must establish title to the surface ownership at his own expense.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in reporting this legislation favorably, has recommended that the bill be amended to provide that if any mineral interests covered by this measure have not been disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture within 7 years from the effective date of the legislation, or within 7 years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests by the United States, whichever date is the later, title to such mineral interests shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for administration under the applicable Federal mineral statutes. That is the amendment which was suggested by the Senate Agriculture Committee and now under consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask about the \$1 provision. Who determines

whether a piece of land is within an active area or not?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary of Agriculture does, with the advice of the Department of the Interior, which has supervision over most of the mineral interests owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. WHERRY. When the Government sold these lands, it reserved the mineral rights anyway, did it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The standard reservation was, in most cases, 75 percent of the mineral rights.

Mr. WHERRY. And anything acquired from the resale is above what the Government paid for the lands in the first place, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; in addition to the consideration heretofore received by the Government.

Mr. WHERRY. It seemed to me that \$1 was a pretty small amount for the transfer of rights. Sometimes people think there are, under land, no mineral deposits, especially oil, and later an oil development occurs. I wondered who made the determination as to whether the dollar provision should apply, or whether it should be a larger amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the event of any mineral activity in an area, then the Secretary of Agriculture must make an investigation, and appraisals must be made by the proper authority, which would be the Secretary of the Interior, who has a corps of people who know a good deal about the subject. The appraisals would be made by them in cooperation with representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that is one of the spots in the bill where there is a great deal of latitude. I suppose it has to be drawn in this way because it would be difficult to determine where mineral deposits would be found.

Mr. ELLENDER. Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have agreed to the method of sale outlined in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope some of the questions I ask will not be too elemental, but I have just seen the bill. The dollar provision attracted my attention. The bill states:

In areas where the Secretary determines after consultation with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities that there is no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application shall be sold for a consideration of \$1. In other areas the mineral interests shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate.

If that is to be gone into, why should it not be handled on the same basis by the men to whom the Senator has referred?

Mr. ELLENDER. Where there is no activity at all, where there are no signs of mineral development, I do not see what investigation could be made.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means it is not necessary?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not necessary. But where there is activity, even around

the land, even a few miles away, investigation would as a matter of fact, be made.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the same investigation be made where there was activity, with the same procedure?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary is authorized and required, in such a case, to have appraisals made by persons with knowledge of the situation. The cooperation would have to be with the Department of the Interior, which has charge of most of the minerals under the public domain.

Mr. WHERRY. I have one or two other questions to ask. Are the mineral rights to be disposed of to the landowners?

Mr. ELLENDER. Solely, and to no one else. The landowner must establish title at his own cost. The minerals cannot be sold to speculators. I will say also, while I am on that subject, that in the past the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation has sold mineral rights to other than landowners, I am informed. This bill corrects that, in that even mineral interests which are owned by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation cannot be sold to anyone other than the owner of the surface land.

Mr. WHERRY. In the future the procedure will be different from that of the past, will it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. The policy would be for the sale to the landowners of mineral interests owned by the Resettlement Administration and the Farm Security Administration, and we prescribe the same method for the sale of mineral interests which are now owned by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

Mr. WHERRY. If the landowner does not make application to buy the mineral rights on a piece of land, is there a statute which runs against him finally?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate Committee on Agriculture has recommended an amendment to cover that situation. If the landowner does not apply within 7 years, then the mineral interests go to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WHERRY. So that unless the option is exercised within 7 years, the mineral rights go to the Department of the Interior, do they?

Mr. ELLENDER. The administration of them, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. As to the receipts for the mineral deposits, I think the bill provides they go to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the report continues:

Section 5 prescribed that all proceeds from sales of mineral interests described in section 1 shall be deposited in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, with the exception that the proceeds from the sales of minerals derived from the assets transferred to the Secretary pursuant to transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations shall be credited to the appropriate corporation account.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator remembers, there was some kind of understanding or method by which some of this land was disposed of through a State

corporation which acted with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Why should the corporation have the balance covered into its account? Does the Senator mean the corporation will take it into its account, and then will account for it to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. They should have a portion because it is theirs.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does it belong to them?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, it was the method pursued by the Department of Agriculture when it first had these lands for sale, that some of it was disposed of cooperatively with an institution organized under State law.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. But why should they keep the money from the sale of these mineral rights? Why should it not be covered into the Treasury of the United States. Is it a matter of accounting?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a matter of legal ownership—they have an interest in it.

Mr. WHERRY. But we are now selling back to the land owner mineral rights, and that is the purpose of the bill. No one else gets those rights. Why should not the money that comes from that equity go into the Treasury of the United States? My experience is that once funds of this nature get into a corporation they never reach the Treasury. The funds are used for some other purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will remember that we had such a situation sometime ago, with respect to other funds, and the Senate passed a bill authorizing their transfer to the Treasury unless application was made by the corporations within a certain period.

Mr. WHERRY. The corporations do not own the mineral rights. The Government owns the mineral rights.

Mr. ELLENDER. The rights were retained jointly.

Mr. WHERRY. Then they have got to account for them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I shall cover that later.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What would be wrong about amending the bill on page 2 by striking out lines 12 through 16, and the first three words in line 17; then beginning in line 20, with the word "area," strike out the remainder of the language on page 2? Section 3 would then read as follows:

The mineral interests shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I see no objection to that Mr. President, except it would entail much additional cost for the administration of the sale of the mineral rights involved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That would cure the defect.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can see no objection to that. The only thing I repeat, is: Why go to the expense of making appraisals where there is no indication at all of any minerals? The Senator must realize that in the sale of these mineral rights, if we impose on the department the duty of making appraisals, the procedure is going to cost money and there will be much delay.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the bill provide that the Secretary has to make an appraisal before he determines "that there is no active mineral development or leasing?"

Mr. ELLENDER. No, sir, in the first instance, where there is no mineral development or leasing.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator read section 3, beginning in line 12 on page 2?

Mr. ELLENDER. The language is:

In areas where the Secretary determines after consultation with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities that there is no active mineral development or leasing.

He is to sell it on that finding and without the necessity of an appraisal.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma submits that it is no more trouble to make a reasonable appraisal than it is to do what the bill prescribes that the Secretary must do in order to determine that it should be sold for only \$1.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot speak for the committee, but as far as I am personally concerned I see no objection to following the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma. The point I wish to emphasize is that as I understand, in the second instance—that is where there is a mineral development—an appraisal must be made. There is a good deal of difference between making an appraisal and simply to inquire whether or not there is any mineral development or leasing in any particular locality. I wish to call that fact to the attention of my good friend from Oklahoma. It is an easy matter to determine whether there have been any leases in one locality or whether there has been any oil research. That can be done merely by letter. But when the Department of Agriculture is forced to make an appraisal as to every farm that is sold, that in my estimation, will cost considerable money and it will entail considerable delay.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Oklahoma a question. Of course, I can see that if a farmer wanted to clear the title to his land and wanted the mineral rights cleared so he could sell his land, it would be beneficial to have done what the bill proposes be done in connection with the orderly procedure of selling the land. I suppose it is worth a dollar to the farmer to secure that title, so he can sell the mineral rights together with the land and give a clear title. I suppose that is

the purpose of the provision for payment of \$1.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose is simply to have the mineral rights transferred to him, whatever they are. There may not be anything under the land at all.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I raised in the first place.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. There may not be any minerals there.

Mr. WHERRY. There might, however, be a development 5 years from now of something which is not known to exist now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That same situation would prevail should a purchase of land be made from a private individual.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I raised. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota raised the point with me a moment ago, that if what the Senator from Oklahoma suggested is done, of course, the farmer would still be co-owner with the Government in the mineral rights.

Mr. ELLENDER. He is that now.

Mr. WHERRY. Then it would not clear the matter up so far as getting title is concerned if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. In most cases of land that was sold by the Farm Security Administration and by the Resettlement Administration, the Government reserved three-quarters of the mineral rights.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to bar the clearing up of title if any benefit of that kind should result to the farm owner, but I do want to submit the point to the Senator which I raised a moment ago, and in which no doubt the Senator from Oklahoma agrees, that it is going to be very difficult to establish whether there are any mineral rights. But after full investigation the fair price can be decided upon if minerals are found to be on the land. That is a pretty good solution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the sentence which contains the language "that there is no active mineral development or leasing" is very plain.

Mr. WHERRY. That does not mean anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. It means where there is no leasing, where there is no geophysical work going on or actual mineral development.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It seems from reading section 3 that the only objective of an appraisal, to begin with, is to determine if there has been work done which resulted in mineral discoveries, subsequent to the purchase of the land from the land owner by the Government. The idea of the bill is to give back to the original owner what he had in the first place.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose is to give back to him what he should have had when first he purchased the land.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, in the Department of Agriculture this was

rather a fast operation; the Government sold something, but kept a part of it.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether in the State of Louisiana and in areas in the West and in the East with which the Senator is familiar, it is customary that those who own the surface of the land automatically own the mineral rights, unless a transaction of this sort has taken place.

Mr. ELLENDER. They do.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not true that only in the past few years the Government has begun not to withhold mineral rights?

Mr. ELLENDER. Before 1946 the Government retained part of the mineral rights, but in 1946 the policy was changed. Since 1946, every acre of land sold by the Government under these farm programs has been sold without reservation of mineral rights. By means of this bill we are trying to put all of the sales in the same category. That is all the bill will do.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. MALONE. That is a very laudable purpose, but I call attention to the fact that if we strike out the first part of the bill, that will mean that all the mineral rights will have to be appraised and sold in accordance with their value.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, to permit me to make an observation, I should like to call attention to the fact that before the Secretary can sell it for one dollar, he must take positive action to arrive at the conclusion that it is not worth more than one dollar.

Let me make the further observation that I am familiar with the occupants of these lands in Oklahoma, and they are not asking the Government to give them these mineral rights for one dollar. They are asking the Government to let them purchase these mineral rights at the fair market value.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because there is much development in Oklahoma. However, there are many sections of the United States where there is no sign of oil or gas or any other mineral development for hundreds of miles away. So why force the Government to go to the expense of making appraisals of all this land?

Mr. KERR. I would say it would be very easy for the Secretary, under the language remaining in the bill, to arrive at a determination, in an appropriate manner, that the value is \$5 or \$10, or whatever amount he might arrive at.

I further suggest that if the amendment is made as suggested, it will result in giving the Secretary the responsibility to make a positive determination with reference to what it is worth, rather than a positive determination that it is worth nothing.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will accept this further suggestion, namely, to incorporate the words "if there is no active development"? In other words, if the land goes back to the person in the same shape that it was in when he first purchased it or before there was any change, there

will be no necessity for an appraisal. If there is no active development, there is no need for an appraisal.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly the point. The first sentence in section 3 puts such land in that category. In other words, if there is no activity at all, that is an indication that there are no minerals there.

Mr. MALONE. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma is fine, if the lack of active development is taken into consideration.

Mr. KERR. Then the Secretary could buy what he deemed appropriate, under the remaining language, and could make a positive determination on that basis.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; but if he was directed to make a positive finding, he probably would get a geophysical survey.

Mr. KERR. It seems to me that the determination should be made on the basis of the fair market value.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the proposal—on the basis of the fair market value, as to all lands where minerals may exist.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me that Congress should take the responsibility of setting the standard rather than to leave general blanket authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in such case. I fully agree that these early lines in section 3 do, on the part of Congress, provide that responsibility be taken by us here by providing that the test shall be whether there is any active mineral development or leasing. If there is any such active mineral development or leasing, then the burden is placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture to make an appropriate appraisal.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But if by checking local operations and competent local authorities, it is determined that there is no active development or leasing, then this measure will be a congressional finding that the Secretary of Agriculture will be justified in holding that the value is purely nominal, and that the sale should be made for \$1.

Of course we are dealing with a rather explosive matter, and I do not think we should impose on the Secretary of Agriculture general responsibility to determine how much such property is worth, regardless of whether there has been any showing of gas or oil or minerals or anything of that sort. It seems to me the showing here provided for is about as good a showing as could be made, namely, that there is an absence of active mineral development or active leasing, in which case the Secretary would be excused from going further, other than to require the payment of a nominal fee. I think that should be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my feeling in the matter. That answers the question of the Senator from Nebraska, I believe.

Mr. President, all proceeds of mineral interests sales authorized under this bill are to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. An exception is made in the case of proceeds from sales of mineral inter-

ests which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations. These receipts shall be credited to the appropriate corporation account, all of which I have previously discussed in answer to questions propounded by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. WHERRY. Likewise, proceeds from sales of mineral interests by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are to remain in the Corporation. I might state that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is wholly owned by the United States Government.

Section 8 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums "as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act." The Secretary of Agriculture estimates that approximately \$65,000 will be required to administer the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, H. R. 4800 was approved by the House of Representatives on June 20, 1949. A Senate Agriculture and Forestry Subcommittee, of which I served as chairman, held open hearings on the bill last March. Representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Justice presented the views of their respective departments. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and a number of Congressmen also testified. All of the testimony received by the subcommittee was favorable to the enactment of the bill. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the measure's adoption. In a letter dated October 14, 1949, and addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with respect to a similar bill, S. 2104, the Secretary of Agriculture states as follows:

The disposal of existing mineral interests under the administration of the Farmers Home Administration and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the best advantage of the United States is of major concern and it is urgent that this Department be given directions by the Congress for the disposal of the mineral interests. S. 2104 contains a consistent, uniform policy for the disposal of the mineral interests and would resolve the problems involved in the existing mineral interests held by these agencies. For these reasons, we recommend its immediate enactment provided the suggested amendment for transferring unsold minerals to the Department of the Interior is included.

As was pointed out, that is being done.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a worthy bill, one that is deserving of favorable action by the Senate. I hope that it will be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield gladly.

Mr. THYE. If this bill is enacted, it will have no bearing, will it, on the sale of mineral rights which may have taken place in the past?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. It would affect only future sales, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. If the Department of Agriculture or a bank sold any of this land, and if any question were raised about it at the hearing—which I understand will be conducted tomorrow—

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. That would have no bearing, would it, on the legislation which we are considering this afternoon?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. This bill has no effect whatever on the sales of mineral rights heretofore made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am interested in this proposed legislation, since there are a number of projects in Missouri which would be affected. A considerable amount of land has been sold by the Government in my State with a reservation of mineral rights. The land was sold under a changing Government policy. In some cases mineral rights were reserved by the Government, while in other cases mineral rights were sold to individuals without any reservation of the mineral title. But the appraisal in all cases was the same.

A manifest injustice has been done to those who bought with the reservation of minerals as against those who acquired title without such reservation. It seems to me that is unfair to the purchasers who bought their land during the period when the mineral rights were reserved by the Government. I believe all the owners should be treated alike. The proposed law is designed to correct that situation by permitting the present owners to acquire the mineral rights to the land.

Under the provisions of the bill, in areas where leasing for the development for minerals is being carried on, a fair price for the mineral rights will be fixed by the Government. Otherwise, the purchase price for the mineral rights will be \$1. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether any lands are now being sold without a reservation of mineral rights?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot be specific, but land could be sold at present by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, but this bill is intended, as I pointed out, to cover primarily lands formerly sold by the Resettlement Administration or by the Farm Credit Administration. Further, it establishes a uniform policy in forcing the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell to the landowners, and to no one else.

Mr. WHERRY. That pleases me very much, but it still does not answer my question. I am speaking about lands which are being sold by the Government, through corporations or otherwise. The Senator said awhile ago, I believe, that if the land is being sold, the mineral rights are included in the sale; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the present law that is correct. The law of 1946

makes it possible for all farm lands purchased by the Government for resale and sold to farmers can be sold with both surface rights and mineral rights.

Mr. WHERRY. In determining the fair market value, under that procedure, are the mineral rights evaluated at approximately \$1, where there is no oil-development activity?

Mr. ELLENDER. No consideration is given to the mineral rights—none whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. No value is attached to it; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The land is sold with everything beneath and everything above.

Mr. WHERRY. And when it is sold in areas where there is activity the mineral rights are considered in determining the value of the land; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. In areas where there is mineral activity the lands sold command a higher price per acre.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LEAHY. Referring to section 3, the disturbing thing to me is as to what is meant by the words "active development." Does that mean actual mining operations? What does it mean? There might be a situation where there are minerals under the land, without actual physical development. In that case, the Government certainly would not want to sell the land on the basis of \$1 for the mineral rights. There may be a technical meaning. I am not familiar with mining terminology. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is supposed that, if the land has not been leased, and if no one is trying to conduct an exploration, there are no important minerals in it. That is the supposition. But where there is actual mineral development under a lease—that is, where there is drilling—in that event an appraisal of the mineral rights ought to be made. I feel sure there are lands in Missouri, South Dakota, and many of the Western States as to which there is not even a quarry in operation. There is no drilling for oil. In cases like that, where there is no evidence of a leasing of the land for mineral purposes or, for that matter, any kind of development, then I presume such land would come into the category referred to by the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. But under that it would seem to me that it would be possible to sell land, when the appraisal indicated the presence of minerals, with the mineral rights appraised at \$1.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, if the Department determines that there are minerals present, in that case an appraisal would have to be made.

Mr. LEAHY. But if there is no activity, the mineral rights would still be sold for \$1, under section 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If

there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate. I suggest that the subcommittee which handled this bill be appointed as conferees. A list of the names of the subcommittee members is in the hands of the clerk.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. THYE, and Mr. KEM conferees on the part of the Senate.

HAWAII IS AN ISSUE IN THE WAR OF IDEAS—LETTER BY SAMUEL WILDER KING

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Washington Star of August 15, 1950, under the heading "Hawaii is an Issue in the War of Ideas." It is a letter which was addressed to the editor of the Star by Mr. Samuel Wilder King, president of the Constitutional Convention of the Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of August 15, 1950]

HAWAII IS AN ISSUE IN THE WAR OF IDEAS TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Our country is immersed in a global contest for the minds of men.

This has become a bloody contest of arms in Korea, which may spread to the far reaches of the earth, involving millions of American lives, even on the North American continent. The extent to which American arms may be committed, the number of American lives which may be lost, must depend basically and ultimately upon our success in winning the war of ideas.

As a native-born resident of the Territory of Hawaii, and formerly its Delegate to Congress, I believe I can speak with some authority on the progress of this war of ideas in the Pacific-Asiatic world.

In Hawaii we are at the crossroads of the Pacific. We constantly meet and talk with visitors from far parts of the Asiatic world. Many of our citizens are in touch from time to time with friends and relatives in various parts of Asia, including Korea.

It is my considered opinion that we have been losing the war of ideologies in Asia. This is a matter of profound and alarming implications for American leadership, American welfare and American lives. We must face the facts. We cannot afford to deceive ourselves.

The cominform is flooding Asia with propaganda depicting America as the exponent of colonial imperialism. They say the conflict in Korea is between greedy American imperialists and the people.

America must counter this intensive, vicious propaganda with an effective campaign of truth. But mere words and lofty abstractions will certainly fail. Most of these people of Asia have had no experience with our

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 40, noes 36.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HART and Mr. RANKIN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 37, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MILLS, having resumed the chair, Mr. SULLIVAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8677) to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 820, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 21, after the period in line 12, insert the following sentence: "No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—yeas 10, noes 54.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 20, nays 330, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll Call No. 252]

YEAS—20

Albert Angell
Baring
Carlyle
Christopher Cunningham
Ellsworth

Feighan
Gathings
Holmes
Horan
Huber
Hull
Kelley, Pa.

Mack, Wash.
Marcantonio
Mills
Rankin
Stockman
White, Idaho

NAYS—330

Abblitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andersen,
August H.
Andrews
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Barden
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Bishop
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Bramblett
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burns
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Clemente
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Crook
Cresser
Curtis
Dague
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Doughton

Douglas
Doyle
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Gilmer
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gross
Gull
Gwynn
Hale
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Herter
Heseltun
Hill
Hobbs
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hollifield
Hope
Howell
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
James
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Keating
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan

Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Linehan
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKimmon
McMillan, S. C.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdoch
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Nixon
Noland
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Peterson
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Plumley
Polk
Potter
Poulson
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman

Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadiak
Sanborn
Sasser
Saylor
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Shafer
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.

Spence
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Tauricillo
Teague
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Towe
Trimble
Underwood
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Wagner

Walsh
Walter
Welch
Welch
Whceler
White, Calif.
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodhouse
Woodruff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—80

Bailey
Barrett, Wyo.
Biemiller
Blackney
Boggs, La.
Boykin
Brehm
Bulwinkle
Carroll
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Cooley
Crawford
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dingell
Dondero
Durham
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Furcolo
Gillette
Gore
Gregory
Hagen
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Hall
Leonard W.

Halleck
Hand
Hare
Hébert
Hinshaw
Jacobs
Johnson
Kearney
Kearns
Keefe
Klein
Latham
Lodge
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Morrison
Murray, Wis.
Norblad
Norton
O'Neill
Pace
Pfeiffer
Joseph L.
Pfeiffer
William L.

Poage
Powell
Quinn
Regan
Rich
Rivers
Sabath
Sadowski
St. George
Scott
Hugh D., Jr.
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Staggers
Sutton
Tackett
Taylor
Tollefson
Werdel
Whitaker
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Williams with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Winstead with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Wilson of Texas with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Short.
Mr. Klein with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Crawford.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Miles with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and Mr. MILLER of Maryland changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CARLYLE and Mr. ELLSWORTH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical mistake in the motion. It should read "the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 251, I am recorded "absent." I voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct roll call No. 251. I am recorded "absent." I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 825, Rept. No. 2989), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9526) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

UN-AMERICAN AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 826, Rept. No. 2990), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9490) to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other

purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2317) to authorize grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for emergency school construction to school districts overburdened with enrollments resulting from defense and other Federal activities, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BARDEN, BAILEY, BURKE, MCCONNELL, and KEARNS.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONVEY CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 2, after "therefore" insert: "Provided, That, in the event any mineral interests covered by this act are not sold as provided herein pursuant to application filed within 7 years from the effective date of this act or within 7 years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests of the United States, whichever date is later, the Secretary shall forthwith transfer title to such mineral interests, with the exception of those which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, to the Secretary of the Interior to be administered under the minerals laws of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain briefly the purport of the amendment?

Mr. GRANGER. The purport of the amendment is that in case property has been acquired by a farmer or landowner and mineral rights have been reserved by the Federal Government, the owner of

the property will have 7 years in which to make application to purchase those mineral rights.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the bill H. R. 1188.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3409) to establish a new Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. PETERSON. This is the bill, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, that I spoke to him about earlier in the day and which was on the Consent Calendar and which was passed over without prejudice. It works out the old Jackson Hole problem; part of it goes to the forest and part of it goes to the Elk refuge. We would have taken it up sooner in the week, but it was asked to go over without prejudice for a special reason. I have cleared it with the objectors on both the majority and the minority sides.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of including in one national park, for public benefit and enjoyment, the lands within the present Grand Teton National Park and a portion of the lands within the Jackson Hole National Monument, there is hereby established a new "Grand Teton National Park." The park shall comprise, subject to valid existing rights, all of the present Grand Teton National Park and all lands of the Jackson Hole National Monument that are not otherwise expressly provided for in this act, and an order setting forth the boundaries of the park shall be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior and published in the Federal Register. The national park so established shall, so far as consistent with the provisions of this act, be administered in accordance with the general statutes governing national parks, and shall supersede the present Grand Teton National Park and the Jackson Hole National Monument. The act of February 26, 1929 (45 Stat. 1314), and any other provisions of law heretofore

17

[PUBLIC LAW 760—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 897—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 4500]

AN ACT

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to sell, as hereinafter provided, all mineral interests now owned by the United States, which have been reserved or acquired by it under any program heretofore administered by the Resettlement Administration, or the Farm Security Administration, or now administered by the Farmers Home Administration, except the program administered pursuant to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the program for the liquidation of labor camps pursuant to Public Law 298, Eightieth Congress.

SEC. 2. Such mineral interests shall be sold only to private persons who shall apply therefor and who at the time of application are the owners of the surface of the land covered by the application. Applicants shall establish their title to the surface of the land covered by the application to the satisfaction of the Secretary at their own expense. Conveyances of mineral interests shall be by quitclaim deed executed by the Secretary or his delegate.

SEC. 3. In areas where the Secretary determines after consultation with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities that there is no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application shall be sold for a consideration of \$1. In other areas the mineral interests shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate. Area determinations made by the Secretary pursuant to this section may be revised from time to time and the consideration to be obtained for the mineral interests in connection with any particular tract of land shall be determined by the rule applicable to the area in which the tract is located at the time of the application therefor: *Provided*, That, in the event any mineral interests covered by this Act are not sold as provided herein pursuant to application filed within seven years from the effective date of this Act or within seven years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests of the United States, whichever date is later, the Secretary shall forthwith transfer title to such mineral interests, with the exception of those which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, to the Secretary of the Interior to be administered under the mineral laws of the United States.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is directed to authorize the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to sell and convey the mineral interests heretofore or hereafter acquired by it in conformity with the policy expressed in this Act with respect to the mineral interests described in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 5. All proceeds from sales made under this Act of mineral interests described in section 1 hereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the proceeds from sales of mineral interests which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations shall be credited to the appropriate corporation account.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. No application for the purchase of mineral interests under this Act shall be filed until ninety days after this Act becomes effective.

SEC. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Approved September 6, 1950.